arXiv:1703.07244v1 [cs.DS] 21 Mar 2017

A Hybrid Feasibility Constraints-Guided Search to the Two-Dimensional Bin Packing Problem with Due Dates

S. Polyakovskiy[a], R. M'Hallah[b,*]

[a] *Optimisation and Logistics Group, School of Computer Science, University of Adelaide, Australia.*
[b] *Department of Statistics and Operations Research, College of Science, Kuwait University, P.O. Box 5969, Safat 13060, Kuwait.*

Abstract

The two-dimensional non-oriented bin packing problem with due dates packs a set of rectangular items, which may be rotated by 90 degrees, into identical rectangular bins. The bins have equal processing times. An item's lateness is the difference between its due date and the completion time of its bin. The problem packs all items without overlap as to minimize maximum lateness L_{max}.

The paper proposes a tight lower bound that enhances an existing bound on L_{max} for 24.07% of the benchmark instances and matches it in 30.87% cases. In addition, it models the problem using mixed integer programming (MIP), and solves small-sized instances exactly using *CPLEX*. It approximately solves larger-sized instances using a two-stage heuristic. The first stage constructs an initial solution via a first-fit heuristic that applies an iterative *constraint programming* (CP)-based neighborhood search. The second stage, which is iterative too, approximately solves a series of assignment low-level MIPs that are guided by *feasibility constraints*. It then enhances the solution via a high-level random local search. The approximate approach improves existing upper bounds by 27.45% on average, and obtains the optimum for 33.93% of the instances. Overall, the exact and approximate approaches identify the optimum for 39.07% cases.

The proposed approach is applicable to complex problems. It applies CP and MIP sequentially, while exploring their advantages, and hybridizes heuristic search with MIP. It embeds a new lookahead strategy that guards against infeasible search directions and constrains the search to improving directions only; thus, differs from traditional lookahead beam searches.

Keywords: cutting, two-dimensional bin packing, batch scheduling, packing heuristic, lookahead search.

*Corresponding author. Tel: +965-669-14150. Fax: +965-248-37332.
Email addresses: Sergey.Polyakovskiy@adelaide.edu.au (S. Polyakovskiy), rymmha@yahoo.com (R. M'Hallah)

1. Introduction

Bin packing (BP) is a classical strongly $\mathcal{NP}$-hard combinatorial optimization problem (Jansen & Pradel, 2016; Johnson et al., 1974). It consists in packing a set of items into as few bins as possible. Because of its prevalence in industry, BP has engendered many variants. Some variants are traditional in the sense that they impose additional constraints on the packing of the items or on the types of bins such as the oriented, orthogonal, guillotine, and variable-sized BP. However, more recent variants combine BP with further complicating combinatorial aspects. For example, BP appears in combination with routing problems which minimize transportation costs subject to loading constraints (Iori & Martello, 2013). It also emerges in lock scheduling (Verstichel et al., 2015) where lockages are scheduled, chambers are assigned to ships, and ships are positioned into chambers.

Similarly, BP occurs in furniture and paper manufacturing concurrently with production planning. All items are assigned to bins then cut from their respective bins. Those assigned to a same bin share a common completion time. In this context, the objective minimizes the total cost, which is a weighted sum of several components such as items' completion times, earliness, tardiness, bins' costs and bins' cutting times. For instance, Li (1996) considers a two-dimensional cutting stock problem where meeting the orders' due dates is more important than minimizing the wasted material. Reinertsen & Vossen (2010) investigate the one-dimensional cutting stock problem within steel manufacturing where orders have due dates that should be met while Arbib & Marinelli (2014) give a short overview on the state of the art. Polyakovskiy & M'Hallah (2011) address the problem of on-line cutting of small rectangular items out of large rectangular stock material using parallel machines in a just-in-time environment. Their problem involves cutting the items from stock material while being cognizant of the resulting earliness-tardiness of each item. It minimizes not only material waste but also the sum of earliness-tardiness; subsequently, it avoids both storing the items and starving the next production stage.

Bennell et al. (2013) compound the non-oriented two-dimensional BP with items' due dates. They minimize simultaneously the number of used bins and the maximum lateness (L_{max}) of the items. They propose a lower bound LB_1 to L_{max} and approximately solve this variant, denoted hereafter V^1, using genetic algorithm (GA), unified tabu search, and randomized descent. They conclude that GA yields consistently the best upper bound L_{max}^{GA} on L_{max}.

V^1 is common in make-to-order low-volume production systems such as the high-fashion apparel industry and food delivery. In these contexts, packing efficiency might be increased by mixing up several orders; however, the increased efficiency can not be at the cost of customer service. That is, a company should choose, from the pool of items emanating from all orders, the ones that need to be cut simultaneously with the objective of maximizing material utilization while producing as many items as possible on time (BenBassat, 2016).

In scheduling terms, the problem is a single machine batching problem that minimizes L_{max} subject to a maximal size of each batch. When each bin is

assigned a single item, it is equivalent to the L_{max} single machine scheduling problem, which is solved by the earliest due date sequence. When jobs are grouped into batches, the problem becomes strongly $\mathcal{NP}$-hard (Brucker et al., 1998). The difficulty of the problem oriented the research towards approximate approaches. For instance, Cabo et al. (2015) propose a split and merge neighborhood search for the case where the processing time of a batch equals the largest processing time of its assigned items and the number of items per batch is bounded. Similarly, Wang & Uzsoy (2002) apply a genetic algorithm for the case where items have release dates.

This paper addresses the non-oriented two-dimensional bin packing problem where items have due dates. This problem, denoted hereafter 2DBPP with DD, searches for a feasible packing of a given set of n rectangular items into a set of at most $b \leq n$ identical rectangular bins, and schedules their cutting as to minimize the L_{max} of the items. Each item is characterized by its width, height, and due date. Its lateness is the difference between its completion time and its due date, where its completion time is that of its assigned bin. All bins' processing times are equal regardless of their assigned items.

Minimizing L_{max} only (in lieu of both the number of used bins and L_{max} as V^1 does) is in no way a shortcoming for three reasons. First, the number of bins is naturally bounded. Second, for a feasible bound on the number of used bins, 2DBPP with DD finds the minimal L_{max}. Thus, it can be applied iteratively to build the Pareto optimal frontier of V^1. Third, it can be used by decision makers as a decision support tool that quantifies the tradeoff between service quality loss and reduction of ecological cost and waste material.

As for all difficult combinatorial optimization problems, finding an exact solution, in a reasonable time, for large-sized instances of 2DBPP with DD is impossible. Indeed, BP variants are generally tackled using approximate approaches that are based on meta-heuristics (Lodi et al., 2002, 2014; Sim & Hart, 2013), including *GA*, and hyper-heuristics (Burke et al., 2006; López-Camacho et al., 2014; Sim et al., 2015). Unlike the aforementioned techniques, the proposed two-stage approximate approach for 2DBPP with DD explores the complementary strengths of constraint programming (CP) and mixed integer programming (MIP). In its first stage, it applies CP. In its second stage, it hybridizes heuristic search with MIP, where MIP is in turn guided by feasibility constraints. In addition, it applies an innovative lookahead strategy that (i) forbids searching in directions that will eventually lead to infeasible solutions and (ii) directs the search towards improving solutions only.

Specifically, The **first** stage builds an initial solution using a new first-fit heuristic, which sorts the items in a non-descending order of their due dates and sequentially packs them into bins. It uses a CP-based neighborhood search to check for the feasibility of a packing. It feeds the first-fit heuristic's solution to the next stage, which updates the maximal number of bins required and initializes the upper bound on L_{max}.

The **second** stage is iterative. It injects the upper bounds to an assignment-based heuristic, which fathoms all solutions that are worse than the incumbent; that is, it imposes that the search be undertaken in an improving direction.

Initially, all bins are empty, all items are free (or non-packed), and all available rectangular regions correspond to bins. Iteratively, the heuristic runs an MIP that assigns free items (i.e., so far non-assigned) to the available rectangular regions and declares them packed. Each assignment results in a partial packing, and generates two new rectangular regions that serve to pack free items in the next iteration. These two regions replace the rectangular area used to pack the item. The heuristic appends the MIP by a set of feasibility constraints that make the heuristic avoid choosing, in the current iteration, a packing that yields an infeasible solution in the future. The heuristic iterates until it finds a feasible packing of all items or MIP fails to fit any item into the available rectangular regions. The second stage proceeds differently on both cases. In the former case, the solution is necessarily better than the incumbent; thus, the second stage tightens the current bounds, and a new incumbent is at hand. In the latter case, the solution is infeasible. Thus, the second stage diversifies it via a random local search technique which modifies the profits of the packed items; thus alters the objective function used in the MIP and leads to different solutions. In either case, this stage is repeated a fixed number of times.

Generally, searching for a feasible packing of a set of items is a hard task due to the symmetry of the problem and to the large number of alternative solutions inherent in the two-dimensional case. A constructive search can be considerably simplified when restricted to an explicit set of possible positions within a bin; for instance to the bottom leftmost coordinates of the free regions of a bin. The search then uses the free regions in a greedy way: it sequentially positions items into these regions and generates new free regions with the objective of maximizing the bin's utilization. Such a decision making process may be myopic and slow for two reasons. First, it packs the items sequentially (i.e., one by one). Second, it does not take into account the size of the items that remain to be packed. The proposed packing, undertaken via an assignment problem, overcomes these two shortcomings.

1. It packs several items (as many as possible) at once into the various available positions via a MIP. This not only speeds the packing but most importantly enhances its density.
2. It imposes a set of feasibility constraints that restrict the MIPs from producing solutions that necessarily lead to an infeasible packing of the remaining items (during future iterations). This innovative mechanism guides the current iteration to cooperate with subsequent ones when packing items instead of making a myopic decision that maximizes the current utilization. Thus, it prunes any infeasible direction at an early stage of the search in lieu of exploring the whole path and eventually discovering that it is infeasible.

Consequently, the proposed assignment based packing approach with its new lookahead strategy is a viable alternative to the constructive heuristics traditionally applied to BP, where bins are filled sequentially in a very greedy manner (Lodi et al., 2002).

In summary, the proposed packing approach uses a lookahead strategy that explores constraints to permanently fathom, at a very early stage of the solution construction process, all partial solutions that eventually lead to infeasible ones. In this way, it is different from beam search, where (i) all non-packed items are tested for each available position in every bin, and (ii) branches yielding the best solution values are retained for branching purposes. Similarly, the proposed approach is different from beam search with lookahead strategies, where (i) a preset number of branches are pursued until obtaining leaf nodes, (ii) the search is then backtracked to the current level of the tree, and a (iii) subset of the nodes judged as potentially good is retained for further branching.

The proposed approach improves the existing upper bound L_{max}^{GA} by 27.45% on average. To the best of the author's knowledge, *GA* is the best approach that addresses 2DBPP with DD in the literature. Finally, relaxing the disjunctive constraints in MIP formulation and augmenting the relaxed problem with feasibility constraints yields a new lower bound LB_3 that tightens LB_1 for 24.07% of the instances, reduces the size of the optimality gap for many cases, and proves the optimality of 39.07% of the cases.

Section 2 gives a mathematical formulation of the 2DBPP with DD. Section 3 provides essential background information on feasibility constraints and CP-based approach for the two-dimensional orthogonal packing problem, a relaxation of the problem at hand. Section 4 presents the existing lower bounds LB_1 and LB_2 and the new one LB_3. Section 5 proposes the two-stage solution approach with Section 5.1 detailing the first-fit heuristic (i.e., Stage one), Section 5.2 describing the assignment based heuristic, and Section 5.3 summarizing the second stage. Section 6 discusses the results of the computational investigation performed on benchmark instances. Finally, Section 7 summarizes the paper and gives some concluding remarks.

2. Mathematical Formulation

Let $N = \{1, \ldots, n\}$ be a set of n rectangular items and $B = \{1, \ldots, b\}$ be a set of b identical rectangular bins, $b \leq n$. Item $i \in N$ has a width w_i, a height h_i, and a due date d_i. It may be rotated by 90^o for packing purposes. Every item must be packed without overlap and must be completely contained within its assigned bin. Bin $k \in B$ has a width W, a height H, and a processing time P. Items assigned to the same bin have a common completion time. When assigned to bin k, item i has a completion time $C_i = kP$ and lateness $L_i = C_i - d_i$. 2DBPP with DD consists in finding a feasible packing of the n items into the available bins with the objective of minimizing L_{max} defined by $L_{max} = \max_{i \in N} \{C_i - d_i\}$.

Let N^* denote the set N appended by the rotated duplicates of the n items, where item $n + i \in N^*$ has width h_i, height w_i and due date d_i, and is the duplicate of item i, $i = 1, \ldots, n$. The problem can then be modeled as an MIP with six types of variables.

- $\boldsymbol{l}$ and $\boldsymbol{b}$ refer to the relative positions of two items assigned to a same bin, where binary decision variable l_{ij} (resp. b_{ij}), $i \in N^*,\ j \in N^*,\ i \neq j,\ j \neq i+n$, and $i \neq j+n$, equals 1 if item i is to the left of (resp. below) item j, and both i and j are assigned to the same bin.
- $\boldsymbol{f}$ signals the assignment of an item to a bin, where binary decision variable f_{ik} equals 1 if item i is packed into bin $k,\ i \in N^*,\ k \in B$.
- $\boldsymbol{x}$ and $\boldsymbol{y}$ denote the position of an item within its assigned bin, where the positive (continuous) variables $x_i,\ y_i,\ i \in N^*$, are the bottom left coordinates of item i.
- The sixth is the objective value, which is the real variable L_{max}.

Using the above six types of decision variables and mimicking the disjunctive constraint modeling technique of Chen et al. (1995) and Onodera et al. (1991), the MIP model ($EXACT$) is given as follows.

$$\min\ L_{max} \tag{1}$$

$$\text{s.t. } l_{ij} + l_{ji} + b_{ij} + b_{ji} - f_{ik} - f_{jk} \geq -1 \qquad (i,j) \in N^{*2},\ i < j,\ j \neq n+i,\ k \in B \tag{2}$$

$$x_i + w_i \leq x_j + W(1 - l_{ij}) \qquad (i,j) \in N^{*2},\ i \neq j,\ j \neq i+n,\ i \neq j+n \tag{3}$$

$$y_i + h_i \leq y_j + H(1 - b_{ij}) \qquad (i,j) \in N^{*2},\ i \neq j,\ j \neq i+n,\ i \neq j+n \tag{4}$$

$$x_i \leq W - w_i \qquad i \in N^* \tag{5}$$

$$y_i \leq H - h_i \qquad i \in N^* \tag{6}$$

$$\sum_{k \in B} (f_{ik} + f_{jk}) = 1 \qquad i \in N,\ j = n+i \tag{7}$$

$$\sum_{k \in B} (kP - d_i) f_{ik} \leq L_{max} \qquad i \in N^* \tag{8}$$

$$l_{ij} \in \{0,1\},\ b_{ij} \in \{0,1\} \qquad (i,j) \in N^{*2},\ i \neq j,\ j \neq i+n,\ i \neq j+n \tag{9}$$

$$f_{ik} \in \{0,1\} \qquad i \in N^*,\ k \in B \tag{10}$$

$$x_i \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0},\ y_i \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \qquad i \in N^* \tag{11}$$

$$L_{max} \in \mathbb{R} \tag{12}$$

Equation (1) defines the objective value. It minimizes the maximum lateness over all jobs. Equation (2) determines the relative position of any pair of items assigned to a same bin. If both items i and j are assigned to the same bin, then one of them is either to left of or below the other. Equation (3) ensures that items i and j do not overlap horizontally if i is to the left of j in the same bin while Equation (4) guarantees that they do not overlap vertically. Constraints (2)-(4) are redundant when i and j are not in the same bin. Equations (5) and (6) guarantee that item i is entirely contained within a bin. Equation (7) forces either item i or its rotated copy $i+n$ to be packed into one of the bins. Equation (8) calculates L_{max} by setting it larger than or equal to the lateness of item i. This latter, given by the left hand side of Equation (8), is the difference between the completion time of item i and its due date. The completion time of i is that of its assigned bin k. Finally, Equations (9)-(12) declare the variables' types.

The model has $\mathcal{O}\left(n^2\right)$ variables and $\mathcal{O}\left(n^3\right)$ constraints. The solution space contains a large number of alternative solutions with many symmetric packing set ups. Subsequently, *EXACT* is hard to solve in practice. Our investigation shows that even small-sized instances with as few as 20 items require significant computational effort.

3. Background

This section presents two ideas explored in the proposed solution technique. These ideas were initially proposed to solve the two-dimensional orthogonal packing problem (2OPP), which is a relaxation of the problem at hand. The first idea is centered around feasibility constraints that our proposed approach uses to guide the search for a feasible packing. The second formulates 2OPP as a variant of the non-preemptive cumulative scheduling problem; which makes CP the most natural solution approach. We herein adopt it to the non-oriented case of 2OPP. Sections 3.1 and 3.2 detail these concepts.

3.1. Feasibility Constraints

Fekete & Schepers (2004) propose a procedure that determines the minimal number L_{2d} of bins needed to pack orthogonally a given set of two-dimensional oriented items. Their approach can be used for the problem at hand to investigate whether it is feasible to pack a set of items into a bin.

Specifically, L_{2d} is the output of a procedure that uses dual feasible functions (DFF), where a function $u : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is dual feasible if

$$\sum_{s \in S} s \leq 1 \Rightarrow \sum_{s \in S} u\left(s\right) \leq 1$$

holds for any set S of non-negative real numbers. Differently stated, their procedure transforms the scaled sizes (w'_i, h'_i) of item $i \in N$ into differently scaled ones $(u_1(w'_i), u_2(h'_i)) \in (0, 1]$ where $w'_i = w_i/W$ and $h'_i = h_i/H$. This transformation imposes that the total sum of the areas of the transformed items be less than or equal to 1 for a feasible packing to exist. That is,

$$\sum_{i \in N} u_1\left(w'_i\right) u_2\left(h'_i\right) \leq 1 \tag{13}$$

must hold for any DFF. The procedure generates many inequalities/constraints in the form of Equation (13) combining the DFFs in various ways. It further adjusts their total number m by setting the DFF input parameters $(p, q) \in (0, 0.5]^2$, and combining DFFs.

Let $\mathcal{A} = (\alpha_{ci}) \in R_{\geq 0}^{m \times n}$ denote the real-valued technological matrix corresponding to Equation (13), where element $\alpha_{ci},\ i \in N,\ c = 1, \ldots, m$, is a scaled area computed using w'_i and h'_i. Furthermore, let $\boldsymbol{t} \in \{0, 1\}^n$ be a binary decision vector such that $t_i = 1$ if item $i,\ i \in N$, is packed into the bin and 0 otherwise. Then the inequality $c,\ c = 1, \ldots, m$, given by

$$\sum_{i \in N} \alpha_{ci} t_i \leq 1 \tag{14}$$

is a valid non-redundant feasibility constraint. A constraint $c,\ c = 1, \ldots, m$, is redundant if $\sum_{i \in N} \alpha_{ci} \leq 1$ or if there exists $c',\ c' = 1, \ldots, m,\ c \neq c'$, such that $\alpha_{ci} \leq \alpha_{c'i}$ for all $i \in N$.

3.2. Solving the 2OPP with Constraint Programming

Because CP is well suited for solving scheduling problems (Bockmayr & Hooker, 2005), we consider herein a relaxation of 2OPP as two non-preemptive cumulative scheduling problems. Specifically, we extend the model of Clautiaux et al. (2008) to the case where items may be rotated. This section first explains how CP tackles a problem. It then presents a CP-based solution of 2OPP.

Consider a problem which consists in identifying a vector of feasible integer values $\boldsymbol{v} = (v_1, \ldots, v_n)$ for a set of variables $Z = \{z_1, \ldots, z_n\}$. Each variable $z_i,\ i = 1, \ldots, n$, has a domain of possible values D_i. A solution $\boldsymbol{z}$ is feasible if $\boldsymbol{v}$ satisfies a finite set $\mathcal{C}$ of constraints given on Z. A promising venue for solving this satisfiability problem is CP, which has been successfully applied to a wide range of combinatorial optimization problems (Rossi et al., 2006). CP uses a search tree to enumerate solutions. Every branch of the tree examines a possible value for one of the variables. When a variable is instantiated, the search runs through $\mathcal{C}$ applying a special-purpose filtering algorithm for each constraint. Filtering eliminates, from the domains of unfixed variables, those values that cannot satisfy the constraint. In CP, a constraint of $\mathcal{C}$ involving variables z_i and z_j is said to be arc consistent with respect to z_i if for each value of D_i there is a feasible value of z_j. Achieving arc consistency for one constraint might make other constraints inconsistent. A constraint satisfaction problem is arc consistent if and only if every constraint of $\mathcal{C}$ is arc consistent with respect to both z_i and z_j. In general, it is hard to achieve full arc consistency. Thus, when calling filtering algorithms repeatedly, CP is trying to reach a certain level of consistency. Subsequently, CP propagates the outcome of its filtering procedure to other constraints. If the domain $D_i = \emptyset$, the search fathoms the node signaling an infeasible solution, and backtracks its path along the search tree. When the domain of every variable z_i is reduced to a singleton $\{v_i\}$, $\boldsymbol{v} = (v_1, \ldots, v_n)$ is the feasible solution of the satisfiability problem.

The relaxation of 2OPP where items may be rotated as two non-preemptive cumulative scheduling problems assimilates a bin to two distinct resources r_w and r_h of capacity W and H, respectively, and the items to two sets of activities $A^w = \{a_1^w, \ldots, a_{2n}^w\}$ and $A^h = \{a_1^h, \ldots, a_{2n}^h\}$ where a_i^w and a_i^h are the width and height of item i, $i \in N^*$. The first (resp. second) scheduling problem investigates whether its set of activities A^w (resp. A^h) can be performed on its machine, within the respective time windows of the jobs, without preemption and without exceeding the availability W (resp. H) of resource r_w (resp. r_h) required by its machine. In fact, A^w and A^h are to be sequenced concurrently but on two separate machines using two different resources. Activity a_i^w has a processing time w_i and a time window $[0, W)$. To be processed, it uses an amount h_i of resource r_h. Similarly, activity a_i^h has a processing time h_i and a time window $[0, H)$. Its processing requires an amount w_i of resource r_w. Let

s_i^w and s_i^h denote the respective starting times of activities a_i^w and a_i^h. Then, s_i^w and s_i^h are the coordinates (x_i, y_i) of item i in the bin. The CP model which solves the 2OPP is then given as:

$$\texttt{Cumulative}([s_1^w, \ldots, s_{2n}^w], [w_1, \ldots, w_{2n}], H, W) \tag{15}$$

$$\texttt{Cumulative}\left(\left[s_1^h, \ldots, s_{2n}^h\right], [h_1, \ldots, h_{2n}], W, H\right) \tag{16}$$

$$\left(\texttt{PresenceOf}(a_i^w) \wedge \texttt{PresenceOf}\left(a_i^h\right)\right) \vee \left(\texttt{PresenceOf}(a_{n+i}^w) \wedge \texttt{PresenceOf}\left(a_{n+i}^h\right)\right) \quad i \in N \tag{17}$$

$$\texttt{PresenceOf}(a_i^w) \neq \texttt{PresenceOf}(a_{n+i}^w) \quad i \in N \tag{18}$$

$$\texttt{PresenceOf}\left(a_i^h\right) \neq \texttt{PresenceOf}\left(a_{n+i}^h\right) \quad i \in N \tag{19}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&\texttt{PresenceOf}(a_i^w) \wedge \texttt{PresenceOf}\left(a_i^h\right) \wedge \texttt{PresenceOf}(a_j^w) \wedge \texttt{PresenceOf}\left(a_j^h\right) \Rightarrow \\ &\left(s_i^w + w_i \leq s_j^w\right) \vee \left(s_j^w + w_j \leq s_i^w\right) \vee \left(s_i^h + h_i \leq s_j^h\right) \vee \left(s_j^h + h_j \leq s_i^h\right) \\ &\qquad\qquad i \in N^*,\ j \in N^*,\ i < j,\ j \neq n + i\end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

Constraint (15) (resp. (16)) forces the activities of A^w (resp. A^h) to complete within the machine's time window without exceeding the resources capacity. Meta-constraint (17) guarantees that only one of the two pairs (a_i^w, a_i^h) and (a_{n+i}^w, a_{n+i}^h) is scheduled, where (a_i^w, a_i^h) and (a_{n+i}^w, a_{n+i}^h) correspond to item i and its rotated duplicate $n + i$. It uses the $\texttt{PresenceOf}(a)$ constraint that states the presence of optional activity a, $a \in A^w \cup A^h$. Constraint (18) forbids scheduling activity a_{n+i}^w when a_i^w is scheduled and vice versa. Similarly, constraint (19) applies for a_{n+i}^h when a_i^h is scheduled. That is, constraints (18) and (19) are redundant in the presence of constraint (17). Finally, constraint (20) secures that no pair of packed items $(i, j) \in N^* \times N^*$, $i < j$, $j \neq n + i$, overlap. The left hand side holds when activities a_i^w, a_i^h, a_j^w, and a_j^h are scheduled and implies the right hand side, which is a disjunctive constraint that avoids the horizontal and vertical overlap of i and j by setting i to the left of j or i above j or j to the left of i or j above i. This constraint is sufficient to ensure the feasibility of a packing. It makes constraints (15)-(19) redundant. However, constraints (15)-(19) are included to strengthen the search.

The search tree is constructed such that variables $s_1^h, \ldots, s_{2n}^h$ are instantiated after variables $s_1^w, \ldots, s_{2n}^w$. This order is recommended by Clautiaux et al. (2008) and is further supported by our preliminary investigation. No other order gave a statistically significant improvement of the performance of the approach.

The performance of any CP-model, including the above one, depends on the solver; in particular, on the filtering and on the search algorithms. Herein, we rely on the IBM ILOG CP Optimizer 12.6.2. We set its search algorithm to the *restart mode*. This mode applies the search algorithm proposed by Vilím et al. (2015). This algorithm adopts a large neighborhood search (LNS). It applies a failure-directed search when LNS fails to identify an improving solution. It assumes that there is no solution or that such a solution is very hard to find. Therefore, instead of searching for a solution, its systematic exploration focuses first on eliminating assignments that are most likely to fail.

When allocated a threshold run time t_{lim}^{PACK}, the *CP Optimizer* acts as a heuristic, denoted hereafter as *PACK*. Preliminary experiments showed that *PACK* fathoms a large portion of infeasible solutions, especially if they are beyond "the edge of feasibility".

4. Lower Bounds

This section discusses lower bound techniques for 2DBPP with DD. Section 4.1 presents two existing lower bounds on L_{max} whereas Section 4.2 introduces a new lower bound. Let $\underline{LB}$ designate the linear-time lower bound algorithm of Dell'Amico et al. (2002) for the non-oriented two-dimensional bin packing problem. $\underline{LB}(S)$ returns a lower bound on the number of bins needed to pack the items of set S.

4.1. Existing Lower Bounds

The procedure to calculate LB_1 proceeds as follows. First, it sorts N in a non-decreasing order of the due dates, and sets $[j]$ to the item with the j^{th} earliest due date. It then uses $\underline{LB}\big(S_{[j]}\big)$, $j = 1, \ldots, n$, to deduce a lower bound of the lateness of the subset of jobs $S_{[j]} = \{[1], \ldots, [j]\}$. Some items must have a completion time $P \cdot \underline{LB}\big(S_{[j]}\big)$; thus, have a lateness of at least $P \cdot \underline{LB}\big(S_{[j]}\big) - d_j$. Therefore, $LB_1 = \max\limits_{j=1,\ldots,n} \{P \cdot \underline{LB}\big(S_{[j]}\big) - d_j\}$ is a valid lower bound on L_{max}.

LB_2, the second lower bound on L_{max}, is the result of the linear relaxation of *EXACT* where all the binary variables are substituted by positive variables in the interval $[0, 1]$.

4.2. New Lower Bound

To the opposite of LB_2, which drops the integrality constraints, the new lower bound LB_3 is the **optimal** value of *RELAX*, which is a mixed integer programming relaxation of *EXACT*. *RELAX* exchanges the disjunctive constraints, given by Equations (2)-(6), with the feasibility constraints defined by Equation (14). The disjunctive constraints define the geometrical relationships between any pair of packed items and between a packed item and its assigned bin. They consider both the height and the width dimensions of the items and bins and ensure the non-overlap of any pair of items and the containment of an item in the bin in both directions. The feasibility constraint, on the other hand, assimilates the item and the bin into dimensionless areas. Its inclusion in *RELAX* tightens the relaxation and improves the quality of the lower bound. Excluding it omits the layout aspect of the problem; thus, can not produce reasonably good bounds. LB_3 is a valid bound if and only if *RELAX* is solved to optimality.

5. Approximate Approaches

The proposed approximate approach *APPROX* solves 2DBPP with DD in two stages. The first stage constructs an initial solution and obtains related upper bounds using a new first-fit heuristic (*FF*). The second stage is iterative. It improves the current solution using both an assignment-based heuristic *HEUR* and its relaxed version *HEUR*$'$, and updates the bounds if possible. When no improvement is possible, it resorts to a diversification strategy. Sections 5.1 - 5.3 detail, respectively, *FF*, *HEUR*, and *APPROX*.

5.1. First-Fit Heuristic

FF solves, via CP, a series of 2OPPs, where each 2OPP determines the feasibility of packing a given set of items into a single bin. It constructs a solution as detailed in Algorithm 1. It sorts the items of N in a non-descending order of their due dates, sets $k = 0$, and applies a sequential packing that iterates as follows until $N = \emptyset$. First, it determines the current bin k to be filled, and initializes its set N_k of packed items to the empty set. It removes the first item from N and inserts it into N_k. Two scenarios are possible.

- If $\underline{LB}(N_k) \leq 1$, it considers the next item of N. (The use of $\underline{LB}(N_k)$ ensures that *FF* starts with a dense packing; thus, limits the number of sequential calls to *PACK*.)
- Otherwise, it undertakes a backward step followed by an iterative sequential packing step. It calls *PACK* from Section 3.2 to determine whether it is possible to pack the items of N_k. When feasibility is violated, the backward step removes the last added item from N_k (because it is causing the infeasibility of the packing) and inserts i back into in N. Then it calls *PACK* again. When a feasible solution is achieved, *FF* proceeds with the iterative sequential packing step.

The constructive step considers the items of N sequentially. For every $i \in N$, it checks whether a feasible packing is possible. Specifically, when $\underline{LB}(N_k \cup \{i\}) \leq 1$, it calls *PACK* to decide whether it is possible to pack the items of $N_k \cup \{i\}$ into the current bin. When this packing is feasible, the constructive step removes i from N and inserts it into N_k. Having tested all unpacked items of N, *FF* proceeds to the next bin by incrementing k to $(k + 1)$ if $N \neq \emptyset$. Hence, *FF* obtains an initial solution, characterized by its number of bins b and its corresponding maximum lateness *UB*. Subsequently, *APPROX* feeds this information to its second stage to search for an improving solution.

5.2. An Assignment-Based Heuristic

The second stage of *APPROX* applies iteratively an assignment-based heuristic *HEUR*, which determines whether it is possible to pack a set of oriented two-dimensional items into a set of multiple identical two-dimensional bins. Solving this problem (i.e., searching for a feasible packing of a set of items) is hard not only because of the large size of the search space caused by the large number

Algorithm 1 First-fit heuristic algorithm FF(N)

```
sort N in a non-descending order of items' due dates;
set k = 0;
while (N ≠ ∅) do
    set k = k + 1;
    open a new bin k setting N_k = ∅;
    while (LB(N_k) ≤ 1) do
        move the first item of N to N_k;
    end while
    while (PACK(N_k) ⟺ infeasible) do
        move the last item of N_k back to its position in N;
    end while
    for each item i ∈ N do
        if ((LB(N_k ∪ {i}) ≤ 1) or PACK(N_k ∪ {i}) ⟺ feasible)) then
            move item i from N to N_k;
        end if
    end for
end while
return solution as (N_1, ..., N_k);
```

of alternative positions of an item within a bin but also because of the symmetry of the bins. One way to deal with this difficulty is to apply a constructive heuristic that focuses on parts of the feasible space; thus, restricts its search to a subset of possible positions. Herein, *HEUR* limits its search space to the free regions within a bin while applying a greedy search. This search space is dynamic: Some free regions are removed while others are created as items are positioned.

HEUR packs simultaneously as many items as possible into the various available regions. This strategy reduces the number of iterations and speeds its reaching a solution; thus, enhances its performance. The packing is undertaken by a two-dimensional assignment problem, referred hereafter as *ASSIGN*.

HEUR implements a new sort of lookahead strategy that directs the search towards a feasible packing. This guiding mechanism imposes feasibility constraints that prohibit the current problem *ASSIGN* from generating partial solutions that will lead to infeasible ones in future iterations. This rather innovative mechanism makes current decisions account for their impact on future ones.

Finally, *HEUR* uses an upper bound UB on L_{max} and an upper bound $b(UB)$ on the number of bins to be used. This further reduces the search space where only a feasible packing whose L_{max} is strictly less than UB is a candidate solution. Initially, UB is the L_{max} of the solution of *FF*.

HEUR initializes the set of packed items $\overline{N} = \emptyset$ and the set of available rectangular regions $E = B$, $|B| = b = b(UB)$. Thus, the set E_k of free regions contained in bin k, $k \in B$, is simply the kth bin: $E_k = \{(W, H)\}$, with $E_k \subseteq E$ and $\cup_{k \in B} E_k = E$. Let $(e, e') \in E^2$ denote two free regions characterised by their respective dimensions (W_e, H_e) and $(W_{e'}, H_{e'})$ and by their bottom left-most coordinate positions (x_e, y_e) and $(x_{e'}, y_{e'})$ in their respective bins. When



Figure 1: Patterns where two regions e and e' overlap.

belonging to a same bin k, two regions e and e' may be overlapping, as illustrated in Figure 1. To guard against assigning two items to the overlap area of e and e', *HEUR* includes a set of geometrical and disjunctive conditions into the assignment model. Because they are automatically satisfied for non-overlapping pairs (e, e'), these constraints are only reinforced if e and e' overlap. To detect such occurrences, *HEUR* introduces four indicator variables.

- $\theta^{\mathrm{i}}_{ee'} = 1$ if e' is at the bottom right of e (i.e., $(x_e < x_{e'}) \wedge (y_e > y_{e'})$ as in Figure 1.a) and 0 otherwise.
- $\theta^{\mathrm{ii}}_{ee'} = 1$ if e' is at the top right of e (i.e., $(x_e < x_{e'}) \wedge (y_e < y_{e'})$ as in Figure 1.b) and 0 otherwise.
- $\theta^{\mathrm{iii}}_{ee'} = 1$ if e' is below e (i.e., $(x_e = x_{e'}) \wedge (y_e > y_{e'})$ as in Figure 1.c) and 0 otherwise.
- $\theta^{\mathrm{iv}}_{ee'} = 1$ if e' is at the right of e (i.e., $(x_e < x_{e'}) \wedge (y_e = y_{e'})$ as in Figure 1.d) and 0 otherwise.

In each iteration, *HEUR* solves *ASSIGN*, which chooses a subset of unpacked items and assigns them to regions of E. To recognize those already packed items, *ASSIGN* uses the indicator variables

- $\rho^{o}_{ik} = 1$ if item $i \in \overline{N}$ is packed in bin $k \in B$ without rotation and 0 otherwise; and
- $\rho^{r}_{ik} = 1$ if item $i \in \overline{N}$ is packed in bin $k \in B$ with rotation and 0 otherwise.

That is, it packs some of the items whose $\sum_{k \in B} \rho^o_{ik} + \rho^r_{ik} = 0$. Let $E^U_i = \cup_{k \in B} \{E_k : kP - d_i < UB\}$ denote a set of regions where item i can only be placed subject to the upper bound UB. Then *ASSIGN* uses the following binary decision variables

- $\varphi^o_{ie} = 1$ if item i is assigned without rotation to region $e \in E^o_i$ and 0 otherwise, where $E^o_i = \cup_{e \in E^U_i} \{e : (w_i \leq W_e) \wedge (h_i \leq H_e)\}$ is the set of regions where item i can be positioned without rotation.
- $\varphi^r_{ie} = 1$ if item i is assigned with rotation to region $e \in E^r_i$ and 0 otherwise, where $E^r_i = \cup_{e \in E^U_i} \{e : (h_i \leq W_e) \wedge (w_i \leq H_e)\}$ is the set of regions where item i can be positioned with rotation.
- $f^o_{ik} = 1$ if item i can be packed without rotation in a future iteration in bin k such that its lateness $Pk - d_i < UB$, and 0 otherwise.
- $f^r_{ik} = 1$ if item i can be packed with rotation in a future iteration in bin k such that its lateness $Pk - d_i < UB$, and 0 otherwise. That is, f^o_{ik} and f^r_{ik} allocate free space for items to be packed in future iterations while ensuring that they do not increase the maximum lateness of the solution.
- $l_{ee'} = 1$ if the right edge of region e is at the left of the left edge of region e' and 0 otherwise.
- $b_{ee'} = 1$ if the upper edge of region e is below the lower edge of region e' and 0 otherwise.

In addition, it uses two types of positive continuous variables: $w_e \in [0, W_e]$ and $h_e \in [0, H_e]$, the width and height of region $e \in E$ when an item is positioned in the bottom-left corner (x_e, y_e) of e.

ASSIGN maximizes the total profit generated by the packed items subject to non-overlap and containment constraints. The profit of an item i, $i \in N$, is a positive value s_i. When $s_i = w_i h_i$, *ASSIGN* maximizes the utilization of the bins; this is equivalent to maximizing the density of the packed items. Formally, *ASSIGN* can be modeled as MIP as follows:

$$\max \sum_{i \in N} s_i \left(\sum_{e \in E_i^o} \frac{\varphi_{ie}^o}{W_e H_e} + \sum_{e \in E_i^r} \frac{\varphi_{ie}^r}{W_e H_e} \right) \tag{21}$$

$$\text{s.t.} \sum_{\substack{i \in N: \\ e \in E_i^o}} \varphi_{ie}^o + \sum_{\substack{i \in N: \\ e \in E_i^r}} \varphi_{ie}^r \leq 1 \qquad e \in E \tag{22}$$

$$\sum_{e \in E_i^o} \varphi_{ie}^o + \sum_{e \in E_i^r} \varphi_{ie}^r + \sum_{\substack{k \in B: \\ E_k \cap E_i^o \neq \emptyset}} f_{ik}^o + \sum_{\substack{k \in B: \\ E_k \cap E_i^r \neq \emptyset}} f_{ik}^r = 1 \qquad i \in N \tag{23}$$

$$\sum_{e \in E_k} \left(\sum_{\substack{i \in N: \\ e \in E_i^o}} \alpha_{ci}^o \varphi_{ie}^o + \sum_{\substack{i \in N: \\ e \in E_i^r}} \alpha_{ci}^r \varphi_{ie}^r \right) + \sum_{\substack{i \in N: \\ E_k \cap E_i^o \neq \emptyset}} \alpha_{ci}^o f_{ik}^o + \sum_{\substack{i \in N: \\ E_k \cap E_i^r \neq \emptyset}} \alpha_{ci}^r f_{ik}^r + \sum_{i \in \overline{N}} (\alpha_{ci}^o \rho_{ik}^o + \alpha_{ci}^r \rho_{ik}^r) \leq 1 \qquad k \in B,\, c = 1, \ldots, m \tag{24}$$

$$\sum_{\substack{i \in N: \\ e \in E_i^o}} w_i \varphi_{ie}^o + \sum_{\substack{i \in N: \\ e \in E_i^r}} h_i \varphi_{ie}^r \leq w_e \qquad e \in E \tag{25}$$

$$\sum_{\substack{i \in N: \\ e \in E_i^o}} h_i \varphi_{ie}^o + \sum_{\substack{i \in N: \\ e \in E_i^r}} w_i \varphi_{ie}^r \leq h_e \qquad e \in E \tag{26}$$

$$x_e + w_e \leq x_{e'} + W_e \left(1 - l_{ee'}\right) \qquad (e, e') \in E^2 : \theta_{ee'}^{\mathrm{i}} + \theta_{ee'}^{\mathrm{ii}} = 1 \tag{27}$$

$$y_{e'} + h_{e'} \leq y_e + H_{e'} \left(1 - b_{e'e}\right) \qquad (e, e') \in E^2 : \theta_{ee'}^{\mathrm{i}} = 1 \tag{28}$$

$$y_e + h_e \leq y_{e'} + H_e \left(1 - b_{ee'}\right) \qquad (e, e') \in E^2 : \theta_{ee'}^{\mathrm{ii}} = 1 \tag{29}$$

$$h_{e'} + (y_{e'} + H_{e'} - y_e) \left(\sum_{\substack{i \in N: \\ e \in E_i^o}} \varphi_{ie}^o + \sum_{\substack{i \in N: \\ e \in E_i^r}} \varphi_{ie}^r \right) \leq H_{e'} \qquad (e, e') \in E^2 : \theta_{ee'}^{\mathrm{iii}} = 1 \tag{30}$$

$$w_e + (x_e + W_e - x_{e'}) \left(\sum_{\substack{i \in N: \\ e' \in E_i^o}} \varphi_{ie'}^o + \sum_{\substack{i \in N: \\ e' \in E_i^r}} \varphi_{ie'}^r \right) \leq W_e \qquad (e, e') \in E^2 : \theta_{ee'}^{\mathrm{iv}} = 1 \tag{31}$$

$$l_{ee'} + b_{e'e} \geq 1 \qquad (e, e') \in E^2 : \theta_{ee'}^{\mathrm{i}} = 1 \tag{32}$$

$$l_{ee'} + b_{ee'} \geq 1 \qquad (e, e') \in E^2 : \theta_{ee'}^{\mathrm{ii}} = 1 \tag{33}$$

$$\varphi_{ie}^o \in \{0, 1\},\ \varphi_{ie}^r \in \{0, 1\} \qquad i \in N,\ e \in E \tag{34}$$

$$f_{ik}^o \in \{0, 1\} \qquad i \in N,\ k \in B : E_k \cap E_i^o \neq \emptyset \tag{35}$$

$$f_{ik}^r \in \{0, 1\} \qquad i \in N,\ k \in B : E_k \cap E_i^r \neq \emptyset \tag{36}$$

$$l_{ee'} \in \{0, 1\},\ b_{ee'} \in \{0, 1\} \qquad (e, e') \in E^2 : \left(\theta_{ee'}^{\mathrm{i}} = 1\right) \vee \left(\theta_{ee'}^{\mathrm{ii}} = 1\right) \tag{37}$$

$$0 \leq w_e \leq W_e,\ 0 \leq h_e \leq H_e \qquad e \in E \tag{38}$$

Equation (21) defines the objective function value as the weighted sum of the profits of packed items where the weight of an item i is inversely proportional to the area of region e used for its positioning. Equation (22) prohibits packing more than one item into any region $e \in E$.

Equations (23) and (24), which are part of the lookahead strategy, employ decision variables $f^*_{ik},\ * = o,\ r$, for $i \in N$ and $k \in B$, to estimate and reserve a free space for unpacked items. Equation (23) forces each item $i,\ i \in N$, to be assigned either to one of the available regions during the current iteration or to one of the suitable bins during a later iteration. Equation (24) imposes the set of feasibility constraints. Here, $c = 1, \ldots, m$ determines a vector of transformed areas computed for all the items on $N \cup \overline{N}$ (corresponding to α^o_{ci}) and their rotated copies (corresponding to α^r_{ci}) and represented via matrix $\mathcal{A}$ (cf. Section 3.1). For every $c,\ c = 1, \ldots, m$, and $k \in B$, Equation (24) requires that the sum of the transformed areas of (i) the items that have been previously packed (corresponding to $\rho^*_{ik} = 1,\ * = o,\ r$), (ii) those packed at the current iteration ($\varphi^*_{ie} = 1,\ * = o,\ r$), and (iii) those to be packed in future iterations ($f^*_{ik} = 1,\ * = o,\ r$) in selected bin k be bounded by 1. Even though it discards many partial solutions that lead to an infeasible packing, Equation (24) doesn't guarantee that unpacked item i will get a feasible position during later iterations.

Equations (25) and (26) determine the width w_e and height h_e of the used area of region e. They impose that the width and height of item i do not exceed, respectively, w_e and h_e if i is assigned to e.

Equations (27)-(33) guarantee the non-overlap of a pair of items packed in two overlapping regions (e, e'). They substitute the disjunctive constraints that are traditionally used to ensure the non-overlap of items packed within a same bin. This substitution reduces the number of constraints by eliminating redundant ones. That is, instead of considering all possible pairs of regions, *ASSIGN* focuses on those that can potentially create an overlap of packed items. It detects these regions using the indicator variables $\theta^{\mathrm{i}}_{ee'} - \theta^{\mathrm{iv}}_{ee'}$.

Equations (27)-(29) focus on the case where e is to the left of e' (i.e., $l_{ee'} = 1$) but e and e' overlap as depicted in Figures 1.a and 1.b. For those regions, Equation (27) forces the $x-$coordinate of the rightmost point of e to be less than or equal to its counterpart for the leftmost point of e'. Equations (28) and (29) constrain the vertical positions of e and e'. Equation (28) deals with the case when e' is below e (i.e., $b_{e'e} = 1$) and $\theta^{\mathrm{i}}_{ee'} = 1$ as depicted in Figure 1.a. It restricts the $y-$coordinate of the topmost point of e' to be less than or equal to its counterpart of the bottommost point of e. Similarly, when $b_{ee'} = 1$ and $\theta^{\mathrm{ii}}_{ee'} = 1$, Equation (29) constrains the topmost $y-$coordinate of region e to be less than or equal to the lowest $y-$coordinate of region e'; thus avoiding the overlap of Figure 1.b.

Equations (30) and (31) deal with two special cases: the left sides of e and e' are aligned vertically, and the bottom sides of e and e' are aligned horizontally. When e and e' are aligned vertically (i.e., their bottom leftmost positions share the same $x-$coordinate) and an item is packed in e, Equation (30) constrains the topmost $y-$coordinate of region e' to be less than or equal to the lowest $y-$coordinate of region e as in Figure 1.c. Similarly, when both e and e' are aligned horizontally (i.e., their bottom leftmost positions share the same $y-$coordinate) and an item is positioned into e', Equation (31) restricts the rightmost $x-$coordinate of region e to be less than or equal to the leftmost $x-$coordinate of e' as illustrated in Figure 1.d.



Figure 2: New regions created by the partial packing of a bin.

Equations (32) and (33) ensure that any pair of overlapping regions (e, e') are such that e is below e', e' is below e or e is to the left of e'. Finally, Equations (34)-(38) declare the types of the decision variables.

When *ASSIGN* returns a feasible solution, *HEUR* moves the packed items from N to $\overline{N}$, and sets the indicator variables $\rho^*_{ik} = 1,\ * = o,\ r$, for $i \in \overline{N}$ and $k \in B$, of the items packed in the current iteration. Next, it calculates the coordinates (x'_i, y'_i) and (x''_i, y''_i) of both the upper left and the bottom right corners of item $i \in \overline{N}$, where $(x'_i, y'_i) = (x_i, y_i + h_i\rho^o_{ik} + w_i\rho^r_{ik})$ and $(x''_i, y''_i) = (x_i + w_i\rho^o_{ik} + h_i\rho^r_{ik}, y_i)$. Finally, *HEUR* updates the set E of free regions and generates new ones within each bin $k,\ k \in B$, using the following two-step approach.

The first step defines the height H_{e^t} and width W_{e^t} of e^t, the region on top of item i. An example of the e^t generated by the packing of an item i is shown in Figure 2.a. To identify H_{e^t}, *HEUR* searches along the vertical ray defined by $x = x_i$ and $y \geq y'_i$ for the first bottom side of another item j if such an item exists. When no item is packed above i, *HEUR* encounters the upper side of the bin. Let $y = y^t$ denote the horizontal line intersecting with this side, where $y^t = y_j$ if j exists, and $y^t = H$ otherwise. It follows that $H_{e^t} = y^t - y'_i$.

Having obtained H_{e^t}, *HEUR* proceeds to determine W_{e^t}. It expands its search along the horizontal line $y = y'_i$; that is, to both the left and right sides of $x = x_i$. It shifts the left edge of e^t until it meets the first right edge of an item a or the left border of the bin. Let $x = x^\ell$ denote the vertical line intersecting this side, where $x^\ell = x''_a$ if a exists, and $x^\ell = 0$ otherwise. Similarly, *HEUR* moves the right edge of e^t until it meets either the first left edge of an item b or the right border of the bin. Let $x = x^r$ denote the vertical line intersecting

this side, where $x^r = x_b$ if b exists, and $x^r = W$ otherwise. Subsequently, $W_{e^t} = x^r - x^l$, and $e^t = (W_{e^t}, H_{e^t})$.

The second step defines the width W_{e^r} and height H_{e^r} of e^r, the region to the right of item i. An example of the e^r generated by the packing of an item i is shown in Figure 2.b. To identify W_{e^r}, *HEUR* searches along the horizontal ray defined by $y = y_i,\ x \geq x''_i$ for the first left side of another item j if such an item exists. When no item is packed to the right of i, *HEUR* encounters the right side of the bin. Let $x = x^r$ denote the vertical line intersecting this side, where $x^r = x_j$ if j exists, and $x^r = W$ otherwise. It follows that $W_{e^r} = x^r - x''_i$.

Having obtained W_{e^r}, *HEUR* proceeds to determine H_{e^r}. It expands its search along the vertical line $x = x''_i$; that is, above and below $y = y_i$. It shifts the bottom edge of e^r until it meets the first top edge of an item b or the lower border of the bin. Let $y = y^b$ denote the horizontal line intersecting this side, where $y^b = y'_b$ if b exists, and $y^b = 0$ otherwise. Similarly, *HEUR* moves the top edge of e^r until it meets either the first bottom edge of an item a or the top border of the bin. Let $y = y^t$ denote the horizontal line intersecting this side, where $y^t = y''_a$ if a exists, and $y^t = H$ otherwise. Subsequently, $H_{e^r} = y^t - y^b$, and $e^r = (W_{e^r}, H_{e^r})$.

Having defined the characteristics of e^t and e^r, *HEUR* examines their "utility". *HEUR* discards region e if (i) e cannot hold at least one of the unpacked items of N or (ii) e can hold an unpacked item but yields a lateness that is larger than or equal to UB. *HEUR* inserts a discarded region e into the set $\overline{N}$ treating e as a dummy item packed into bin k. This insertion strengthens Equation (24). Finally, *HEUR* inserts all non-discarded regions into E, and checks whether the stopping criterion is satisfied. In fact, *HEUR* stops when (i) all the items are packed or (ii) there is an unpacked item that does not fit into any region of E. When the stopping criterion is not met, *HEUR* runs another iteration with respect to the altered sets of items N and $\overline{N}$.

5.3. Solution Process as a Whole

APPROX, detailed in Algorithm 2, consists of two stages. The first stage applies *FF* to obtain an initial feasible solution to 2DBPP with DD along with an upper bound UB on L_{max} and an upper bound $b(UB)$ on the number of bins in an optimal solution. The second stage strives to improve these two bounds and the current solution using both the assignment-based heuristic *HEUR* and its relaxed version *HEUR*$'$.

Specifically, the second stage of *APPROX* solves the non-oriented 2OPP with $b = b(UB) = \max_{i \in N} \{\lfloor (UB + d_i)/P \rfloor\}$ bins so that the maximal lateness of any feasible solution is strictly less than UB. It solves the problem in two steps, each consisting of two loops: An outer loop whose objective is to identify a solution with a tighter UB rapidly and an inner loop whose objective is to refine the search.

In the first step, the outer loop (cf. lines 5-21 of Algorithm 2) resets the profits $s_i = w_i h_i,\ i \in N$, and the iteration counter *count* to 1. Then the inner loop runs *HEUR*$'$ (cf. lines 8-17), which is a reduced version of *HEUR* where

Equation (24) and the decision variables f^o_{ik} and $f^r_{ik},\ i \in N,\ k \in B$, are omitted from the model *ASSIGN*. *HEUR′* is generally weaker than *HEUR* in terms of the tightness of the upper bound of lateness but is faster in terms of run time. When it obtains a feasible solution, *HEUR′* feeds *APPROX* with a solution whose $L_{max} < UB$; that is, it tightens *UB*. This feasible solution may also reduce $b = b(UB)$. Subsequently, *APPROX* exits the inner loop and runs one more iteration calling *HEUR′* again but this time with new values of *UB* and b.

On the other hand, when *HEUR′* fails to find a feasible solution, the inner loop diversifies the search by using a different set of random profits. It changes the profits to $s_i = \gamma w_i h_i,\ i \in N$, where γ is a random real from the continuous *Uniform*[1,3], and increments *count* by 1. If *count* is less than or equal to a maximal number of iterations a^{HEUR}_{lim}, the inner loop starts a new iteration by solving *HEUR′* with its modified profits in the objective function (i.e., in Equation (21) of *ASSIGN*).

When *count* reaches the limit a^{HEUR}_{lim}, *APPROX* proceeds with the second step, which performs exactly the same actions as the first step does except that it applies *HEUR* instead of *HEUR′*. The use of *HEUR* should improve the search. Therefore, the first step pre-solves the problem quickly while the second looks for an enhanced solution.

Modifying the weight coefficients of Equation (21) of *ASSIGN* is a random local search (*RLS*). The choice of this particular diversification strategy along with this specific range of γ was based on preliminary computational investigations. Tests have shown that *RLS* yields, on average, better results than evolutionary strategies and techniques such as the method of sequential value correction (G. Belov, 2008). The superiority of *RLS* is due to the items' random order, which is further accentuated by the unequal weights. Classical approaches on the other hand do not tackle the highly symmetric nature of bin packing solutions. They mainly construct solutions based on the sequential packing of items in ascending order of their areas/widths/heights (Lodi et al., 2002).

6. Computational Experiments

The objective of the computational investigation is threefold. First, it compares the proposed lower bound LB_3 to both LB_1 and LB_2. Second, it assesses the quality of the solution values of *FF*, *APPROX* and *EXACT*. Third, it compares the performance of *FF* and *APPROX* to that of *GA*. All comparisons apply the appropriate statistical tests. All inferences are made at a 5% significance level, and all confidence interval estimates have a 95% confidence level.

APPROX is implemented in C#, which evokes *IBM ILOG Optimization Studio 12.6.2* to handle MIP and CP models. It is run on a PC with 4 Gb RAM and 3.06 GHz Dual Core processor. The time limit t^{PACK}_{lim} for *PACK* is set to 3 seconds. This setting, inferred from preliminary computational investigations, gives the best tradeoff between density of packing and runtime. Indeed, a longer t^{PACK}_{lim} does not necessarily lead to better packing solutions while it unduely increases the runtime of *FF*. Similarly, a shorter t^{PACK}_{lim} often hinders *FF* from reaching a feasible packing; thus causes poor quality solutions. The maximal

Algorithm 2 The framework of *APPROX*

1: **Stage 1: Initialization**
2: run *FF* to obtain an initial solution;
3: compute UB and $b{=}b(UB){=}\max_{i\in N}\{\lfloor(UB{+}d_i)/P\rfloor\}$ based on the solution of Line 2;
4: **Stage 2: Iterative Step**
5: **repeat**
6: set $s_i = w_i h_i,\ i \in N$;
7: set $count = 0$;
8: **repeat**
9: call $HEUR'$;
10: **if** ($HEUR'$ returns a feasible solution) **then**
11: compute UB and $b = b(UB)$ based on the solution of Line 9;
12: break;
13: **else**
14: modify $s_i = \gamma w_i h_i,\ i \in N$, in Equation (21) of *ASSIGN*;
15: set $count = count + 1$;
16: **end if**
17: **until** $count \leq a_{lim}^{HEUR}$
18: **if** $count > a_{lim}^{HEUR}$ **then**
19: break;
20: **end if**
21: **until** true
22: repeat lines 5-21 replacing $HEUR'$ with $HEUR$;

number of iterations for *count* is set to $a_{lim}^{HEUR} = 100$, which also represents the best trade-off between quality and performance of *APPROX* according to our early tests. Furthermore, $p = q = 0.15$, and up to $m = 40$ feasibility constraints are generated for the model *ASSIGN* of Section 5.2. A larger number of constraints does not generally improve the solution quality but increases the runtime of *ASSIGN*. Despite their large variety, the feasibility constraints of *ASSIGN* do not always tighten the lower bound on the free space available for packing. Therefore, their larger number does not necessarily tighten the model.

Section 6.1 presents the benchmark set. Section 6.2 measures the tightness of LB_3. Section 6.3 assesses the performance of *FF*, *APPROX* and *EXACT* in terms of their optimality gaps and the number of times they reach the optimum. Finally, Section 6.4 compares the results of *FF*, *APPROX* and *GA*.

6.1. Computational Set Up

The benchmark set (Bennell et al., 2013) uses square bins whose processing time $P = 100$. It consists of 10 categories as detailed in Table 1. Column 2 gives the length of the bin's side S; i.e., $W = H = S$. Column 3 specifies how items are generated. Each category corresponds to specific characteristics of the dimensions of the items, with categories 1-6 having homogeneous items that are randomly generated from a specific discrete uniform whereas categories 7-10 contain heterogeneous items belonging to four types in various proportions. The four types correspond to items whose (w_i, h_i) are randomly selected from discrete uniforms on the respective ranges:

Table 1: Generation of the widths and heights of items

Category	Bin size (S)	Item size (w_i, h_i)
1	10	uniformly random in $[1, 10]$
2	30	uniformly random in $[1, 10]$
3	40	uniformly random in $[1, 35]$
4	100	uniformly random in $[1, 35]$
5	100	uniformly random in $[1, 100]$
6	300	uniformly random in $[1, 100]$
7	100	type 1 with probability 70%; type 2, 3, 4 with probability 10% each
8	100	type 2 with probability 70%; type 1, 3, 4 with probability 10% each
9	100	type 3 with probability 70%; type 1, 2, 4 with probability 10% each
10	100	type 4 with probability 70%; type 1, 2, 3 with probability 10% each

- type 1: $\left(\left[\frac{2}{3}S, S\right], \left[1, \frac{1}{2}S\right]\right)$;
- type 2: $\left(\left[1, \frac{1}{2}S\right], \left[\frac{2}{3}S, S\right]\right)$;
- type 3: $\left(\left[\frac{1}{2}S, S\right], \left[\frac{1}{2}S, S\right]\right)$; and
- type 4: $\left(\left[1, \frac{1}{2}S\right], \left[1, \frac{1}{2}S\right]\right)$.

The categories can be divided into two sets according to the relative size of the items with respect to S. The first set, referred to as $\mathcal{L}$, contains instances with relatively large items. It consists of categories 1, 3, 5, 7, 8, and 9. The second set, denoted as $\mathcal{S}$, contains instances with small items. It consists of categories 2, 4, 6, and 10.

For each category, there are five problem sizes: $n = 20,\ 40,\ 60,\ 80$, and 100, and ten instances per category and problem size. For each of the 500 problems, there are three classes A, B, and C of due dates, generated, respectively, from the discrete $\mathit{Uniform}[101, \beta P \cdot \underline{LB}]$ where $\beta = 0.6, 0.8$, and 1.0. Thus, a total of 1500 instances are tested.

6.2. Quality of the Lower Bounds

This section compares the performance of three lower bounds: LB_1, LB_2, and LB_3. While LB_1 is computed via the algorithm of Section 4, LB_2 is the value of the incumbent returned by *CPLEX* and LB_3 is the optimal value of *RELAX* when *CPLEX* identifies the optimum within 1 hour of runtime. Table 2 summarizes the statistics of the lower bounds per class, category, and problem size. It displays

- $\gamma_\bullet$, the average percent deviation of $LB_\bullet$, $\bullet = 1, 2, 3$, from the tightest lower bound LB^* where $LB^* = \max\{LB_1, LB_2, LB_3, EXACT\}$, and $\gamma_\bullet = 100\% \frac{(LB^* - LB_\bullet)}{LB^*}$, with $EXACT$ included in the computation of LB^* only when $EXACT$ is proven optimal;
- $\eta_\bullet$, the number of times $LB_\bullet = LB^*$, $\bullet = 1, 2, 3$; and
- $\#$, the number of times LB_3 is not a valid bound; i.e., the number of times the linear programming solver *CPLEX* fails to prove the optimality of its incumbent within the 1 hour time limit.

Table 3 reports statistics of the runtime of LB_3 along with the tallied # per class, category and problem size. The statistics of the runtime are the average RT, median Q_2, minimum $\underline{RT}$ and maximum $\overline{RT}$; all in seconds. The median, known also as the 50th percentile, separates the ordered data into two parts having equal numbers of observations. It is a more appropriate measure of central tendency in the presence of outliers or when the distribution of the data is not symmetric. The missing values in Tables 2 and 3 correspond to cases where all ten instances are unsolved by LB_3; i.e., # equals 10. The analysis of Tables 2 and 3 suggests the following.

LB_1 is the best lower bound in 1083 instances. Over all instances, its average deviation from LB^* is 5.7%. Its runtime is very reduced.

LB_2 never outperforms LB_3 nor LB_1. It matches LB^* for only 111 out of 1500 instances; i.e., in 7.40% of the cases. These 111 instances have $n = 20$ and 40. They belong to categories 2, 4, and 6. The average percent deviation of LB_2 from LB^* is 72.5%.

LB_3 is a valid bound for 1244 instances. Its average runtime is 74.91 seconds. Its much smaller median (2.65 seconds) signals the existence of some outlier cases that are unduely increasing the mean. This is expected since *CPLEX* is allocated up to one hour to prove the optimality of its incumbent.

For those 1244 instances, LB_3 enhances LB_1 for 361 out of 1500 instances; i.e., in 24.07% cases. Its average enhancement over these 361 instances is 31.30%. In addition, it matches LB_1 for another 463 instances; i.e., in 30.87% cases. Subsequently, it is the best lower bound (among LB_3, LB_2, LB_1) in 824 cases.

Figure 3 displays the box plots of the percent deviations $\gamma_\bullet$ of $LB_\bullet$, $\bullet = 1, 2, 3$, from LB^* as a function of the class, size, category and set of the instances. A box plot reflects the central tendency, spread, and skewness of the observed values. Its box corresponds to the three quartiles (i.e., the 25th, 50th and the 75th percentiles) whereas its fences extend to the lowest and largest value of the data. Its stars signal outlier values, which correspond to unusual observations.

As inferred from Figure 3, LB_3 outperforms LB_1 for small-sized instances with $n = 20$ and 40. It is superior for categories 1, 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, which in fact constitute the set $\mathcal{L}$. Overall, the average percent deviations of LB_3 from LB_1 and from LB^* are 3.58% and 14.1%.

Furthermore, LB_3 strictly dominates LB_2 in 1074 cases. The three quartiles of the percent improvement, over all instances, are: 146.4, 218.9 and 417.1; implying a further larger enhancement for the cases with strict dominance. That is, LB_3 is at least one order of magnitude larger than LB_2 in most instances.

6.3. Quality of the new upper bounds

Table 4 displays for each class, type, and problem size, the average percent deviation δ^F, δ^A, δ^E, of the upper bounds L^F_{max}, L^A_{max}, L^E_{max}, obtained respectively by *FF*, *APPROX* and *EXACT*, from the best known lower bound LB^*. In addition, Table 4 displays $\eta^\bullet$, the number of times $L^\bullet_{max} = LB^*$, $\bullet = F,\ A,\ E$.

Table 4 infers the following results.

Table 2: Comparison of Lower bounds

		Class A							Class B							Class C							All classes						
	n	γ_1	γ_2	γ_3	η_1	η_2	η_3	#	γ_1	γ_2	γ_3	η_1	η_2	η_3	#	γ_1	γ_2	γ_3	η_1	η_2	η_3	#	γ_1	γ_2	γ_3	η_1	η_2	η_3	#
1	20	6.3	65.9	0.6	4	0	8	0	7.7	78.4	3.0	4	0	6	0	14.0	85.8	0.8	4	0	7	0	9.3	76.7	1.5	12	0	21	0
1	40	5.0	59.1	0.0	5	0	9	1	8.8	68.9	0.0	3	0	9	0	24.3	85.2	0.0	2	0	10	0	12.7	71.1	0.0	10	0	28	1
1	60	5.3	55.4	0.0	5	0	9	1	13.6	60.8	0.0	2	0	9	1	21.6	81.6	0.0	3	0	9	1	13.5	66.0	0.0	10	0	27	3
1	80	9.3	52.5	0.0	2	0	9	1	14.6	57.6	0.0	2	0	8	2	28.0	83.5	0.0	3	0	8	2	17.3	64.5	0.0	7	0	25	5
1	100	1.7	50.9	0.0	8	0	4	6	3.6	59.7	0.0	6	0	5	5	16.0	82.8	0.0	3	0	7	3	7.1	64.5	0.0	17	0	16	14
		5.5	56.8	0.2	24	0	39	9	9.7	65.1	0.7	17	0	37	8	20.8	83.8	0.2	15	0	41	6	12.0	68.5	0.4	56	0	117	23
2	20	0.0	0.0	0.0	10	10	10	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10	10	10	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10	10	10	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	30	30	30	0
2	40	0.0	84.3	41.5	10	1	2	0	0.0	89.8	46.4	10	1	1	0	0.0	90.0	55.4	10	1	1	0	0.0	88.1	47.7	30	3	4	0
2	60	0.0	87.3	29.1	10	0	0	0	0.0	98.6	33.3	10	0	0	0	0.0	100.0	60.6	10	0	0	0	0.0	95.3	41.0	30	0	0	0
2	80	0.0	82.4	11.8	10	0	0	0	0.0	97.0	21.3	10	0	0	0	0.0	100.0	44.0	10	0	0	0	0.0	93.1	25.7	30	0	0	0
2	100	0.0	87.0	34.2	10	0	0	0	0.0	99.8	50.0	10	0	0	0	0.0	100.0	75.3	10	0	0	0	0.0	95.6	53.2	30	0	0	0
		0.0	68.2	23.3	50	11	12	0	0.0	77.1	30.2	50	11	11	0	0.0	78.0	47.0	50	11	11	0	0.0	74.4	33.5	150	33	34	0
3	20	4.7	75.1	7.4	5	0	7	0	7.0	89.7	3.5	7	0	6	0	20.9	94.9	11.2	4	0	5	0	10.9	86.5	7.4	16	0	18	0
3	40	8.2	63.9	0.9	5	0	9	0	12.1	79.8	0.4	5	0	8	0	9.5	89.1	7.7	6	0	6	0	9.9	77.6	3.0	16	0	23	0
3	60	8.1	60.5	0.0	3	0	9	1	11.2	69.4	0.1	4	0	9	0	23.7	84.7	0.0	2	0	9	1	14.3	71.5	0.1	9	0	27	2
3	80	4.2	58.6	0.0	5	0	7	3	4.2	65.3	0.0	7	0	4	6	13.3	78.3	0.0	6	0	7	3	7.2	67.4	0.0	18	0	18	12
3	100	3.1	53.5	0.0	6	0	4	6	5.1	63.1	0.0	6	0	5	5	13.7	90.2	0.0	6	0	5	5	7.3	68.9	0.0	18	0	14	16
		5.7	62.3	2.1	24	0	36	10	7.9	73.5	1.0	29	0	32	11	16.2	87.4	4.6	24	0	32	9	9.9	74.4	2.6	77	0	100	30
4	20	0.0	0.0	0.0	10	10	10	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10	10	10	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10	10	10	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	30	30	30	0
4	40	0.0	84.4	50.3	10	1	3	0	0.0	89.7	51.6	10	1	2	0	0.0	90.0	65.3	10	1	1	0	0.0	88.0	55.8	30	3	6	0
4	60	0.0	84.2	20.5	10	0	0	0	0.0	96.4	23.7	10	0	0	0	0.0	100.0	48.1	10	0	1	0	0.0	93.5	30.8	30	0	1	0
4	80	0.0	82.1	17.0	10	0	0	0	0.0	97.3	22.6	10	0	0	0	0.0	100.0	57.9	10	0	0	0	0.0	93.1	32.5	30	0	0	0
4	100	0.0	84.9	25.7	10	0	0	0	0.0	98.5	45.4	10	0	0	0	0.0	100.0	72.1	10	0	0	0	0.0	94.5	47.7	30	0	0	0
		0.0	67.1	22.7	50	11	13	0	0.0	76.4	28.7	50	11	12	0	0.0	78.0	48.7	50	11	12	0	0.0	73.8	33.4	150	33	37	0
5	20	6.1	69.7	1.9	5	0	7	0	16.4	85.1	7.8	5	0	6	0	20.9	92.1	7.7	5	0	6	0	14.5	82.3	5.8	15	0	19	0
5	40	7.4	58.1	0.0	4	0	9	1	7.0	71.6	0.2	5	0	8	1	23.9	91.4	3.4	2	0	9	0	12.8	73.7	1.3	11	0	26	2
5	60	4.9	62.4	0.0	5	0	7	3	1.4	65.3	0.0	8	0	7	3	20.1	82.0	0.0	5	0	10	0	8.8	69.9	0.0	18	0	24	6
5	80	5.7	54.1	0.0	5	0	6	4	8.7	62.6	0.0	6	0	5	5	19.7	75.9	0.0	3	0	8	2	11.4	64.2	0.0	14	0	19	11
5	100	1.7	56.0	0.0	7	0	3	7	0.0	55.0	0.0	10	0	1	9	18.6	76.9	0.0	3	0	8	2	6.8	62.6	0.0	20	0	12	18
		5.2	60.1	0.5	26	0	32	15	6.7	67.9	2.5	34	0	27	18	20.6	83.7	2.4	18	0	41	4	10.8	70.5	1.9	78	0	100	37
6	20	0.0	0.0	0.0	10	10	10	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10	10	10	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10	10	10	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	30	30	30	0
6	40	0.0	49.2	20.8	10	5	5	0	0.0	50.0	21.3	10	5	6	0	0.0	50.0	29.7	10	5	5	0	0.0	49.7	23.9	30	15	16	0
6	60	0.0	87.2	8.4	10	0	0	0	0.0	98.9	17.3	10	0	0	0	0.0	100.0	46.2	10	0	0	0	0.0	95.4	24.0	30	0	0	0
6	80	0.0	93.9	42.4	10	0	0	0	0.0	100.0	60.0	10	0	0	0	0.0	100.0	83.8	10	0	0	0	0.0	98.0	62.1	30	0	0	0
6	100	0.0	87.3	23.8	10	0	0	0	0.0	99.4	38.7	10	0	0	0	0.0	100.0	73.2	10	0	0	0	0.0	95.6	45.2	30	0	0	0
		0.0	63.5	19.1	50	15	15	0	0.0	69.7	27.5	50	15	16	0	0.0	70.0	46.6	50	15	15	0	0.0	67.7	31.0	150	45	46	0
7	20	11.8	71.4	10.2	2	0	1	0	21.5	84.1	18.1	1	0	1	0	42.4	96.0	28.1	1	0	2	0	25.2	83.9	18.8	4	0	4	0
7	40	2.3	64.0	0.7	5	0	5	1	5.6	73.2	1.2	6	0	7	1	24.4	96.0	1.4	1	0	9	0	10.8	77.7	1.1	12	0	21	2
7	60	0.0	59.9	0.4	10	0	0	9	0.0	74.0	8.3	10	0	0	8	4.1	88.2	5.3	8	0	5	2	1.4	74.1	5.4	28	0	5	19
7	80	0.0	57.8	0.0	10	0	1	9	0.0	63.6		10	0		10	7.4	79.2	0.0	7	0	3	7	2.5	66.9	0.0	27	0	4	26
7	100	0.0	56.1		10	0		10	0.0	59.9		10	0		10	2.8	90.1	8.4	9	0	1	8	0.9	68.7	8.4	29	0	1	28
		2.8	61.8	5.2	37	0	7	29	5.4	70.9	10.0	37	0	8	29	16.2	89.9	10.7	26	0	20	17	8.1	74.2	8.9	100	0	35	75
8	20	17.6	71.0	15.6	1	0	1	0	20.2	82.0	20.6	1	0	1	0	47.7	95.9	28.4	0	0	1	0	28.5	83.0	21.5	2	0	3	0
8	40	0.0	59.2	1.0	10	0	7	2	5.9	75.3	0.0	4	0	8	2	12.6	93.0	0.0	5	0	10	0	6.2	75.8	0.3	19	0	25	4
8	60	0.0	64.4	4.2	10	0	1	6	0.7	74.5	0.0	9	0	3	7	5.4	90.0	16.7	7	0	5	4	2.1	76.3	9.0	26	0	9	17
8	80	0.0	55.6		10	0		10	0.0	57.6		10	0		10	1.3	93.9	0.0	9	0	2	8	0.4	69.1	0.0	29	0	2	28
8	100	0.0	55.8	5.1	10	0	0	9	0.0	63.5	0.0	10	0	1	9	0.5	92.1	0.0	9	0	1	9	0.2	70.5	1.7	29	0	2	27
		3.5	61.2	8.1	41	0	9	27	5.3	70.6	9.4	34	0	13	28	13.5	93.0	13.2	30	0	19	21	7.5	74.9	10.5	105	0	41	76
9	20	0.0	61.4	0.0	10	0	10	0	0.0	71.4	0.0	10	0	10	0	0.0	81.1	0.0	10	0	10	0	0.0	71.3	0.0	30	0	30	0
9	40	2.5	57.5	0.0	7	0	10	0	2.9	75.8	0.0	7	0	10	0	4.7	80.2	0.0	9	0	10	0	3.4	71.1	0.0	23	0	30	0
9	60	1.6	58.1	0.0	7	0	10	0	2.6	66.1	0.0	7	0	10	0	4.6	81.0	0.0	8	0	10	0	2.9	68.4	0.0	22	0	30	0
9	80	2.1	56.2	0.0	5	0	10	0	2.7	65.3	0.0	6	0	10	0	15.2	79.9	0.0	6	0	10	0	6.7	67.1	0.0	17	0	30	0
9	100	1.7	55.1	0.0	5	0	10	0	2.9	65.0	0.0	5	0	10	0	5.2	77.9	0.0	5	0	10	0	3.3	66.0	0.0	15	0	30	0
		1.6	57.7	0.0	34	0	50	0	2.2	68.7	0.0	35	0	50	0	5.9	80.0	0.0	38	0	50	0	3.2	68.8	0.0	107	0	150	0
10	20	9.4	72.5	7.8	5	0	6	0	15.0	80.1	13.9	4	0	4	0	13.0	96.5	3.4	6	0	7	0	12.5	83.1	8.4	15	0	17	0
10	40	3.0	68.5	5.0	8	0	5	0	2.6	75.9	1.4	7	0	7	0	8.6	91.8	13.2	7	0	6	0	4.8	78.7	6.5	22	0	18	0
10	60	0.0	64.9	4.6	10	0	4	1	5.7	76.0	6.9	6	0	4	1	15.3	98.7	6.5	6	0	5	0	7.0	79.9	6.0	22	0	13	2
10	80	0.0	60.8	3.4	10	0	4	3	0.7	68.1	2.6	8	0	5	1	10.3	98.0	4.1	7	0	6	1	3.7	75.7	3.3	25	0	15	5
10	100	0.4	56.8	3.1	9	0	3	3	0.6	66.7	4.7	8	0	3	4	3.2	92.0	10.8	9	0	4	1	1.4	71.8	6.7	26	0	10	8
		2.6	64.7	5.0	42	0	22	7	5.0	73.4	6.1	33	0	23	6	10.1	95.4	7.6	35	0	28	2	5.9	77.8	6.3	110	0	73	15
All		2.7	62.3	9.6	378	37	235	97	4.2	71.3	12.9	369	37	229	100	10.3	83.9	19.3	336	37	269	59	5.7	72.5	14.1	1083	111	733	256

Table 3: Statistics of the runtime of LB_3

		Class A					Class B					Class C					All classes				
	n	RT	Q_2	$\underline{RT}$	$\overline{RT}$	#	RT	Q_2	$\underline{RT}$	$\overline{RT}$	#	RT	Q_2	$\underline{RT}$	$\overline{RT}$	#	RT	Q_2	$\underline{RT}$	$\overline{RT}$	#
1	20	2.14	1.86	0.22	4.74	0	2.04	1.97	0.29	5.01	0	1.99	1.90	0.27	4.11	0	2.05	1.90	0.22	5.01	0
1	40	8.87	4.92	0.65	24.24	1	32.87	5.65	0.62	255.06	0	10.11	4.32	0.47	39.24	0	17.57	4.61	0.47	255.06	1
1	60	53.65	16.54	4.88	313.27	1	51.58	12.94	3.86	239.62	1	79.90	14.31	6.81	452.46	1	61.71	16.19	3.86	452.46	3
1	80	124.08	51.46	15.52	450.12	1	539.04	41.87	15.25	3587.90	2	32.16	25.35	13.46	63.91	2	227.45	33.14	13.46	3587.90	5
1	100	609.61	532.60	95.66	1277.58	6	316.59	281.97	69.87	641.00	5	332.34	257.04	50.84	1129.49	3	396.74	300.79	50.84	1277.58	14
		100.96	15.52	0.22	1277.58	9	159.73	12.46	0.29	3587.90	8	77.81	12.42	0.27	1129.49	6	112.37	13.46	0.22	3587.90	23
2	20	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0
2	40	0.92	0.50	0.01	2.95	0	0.82	0.61	0.01	1.94	0	0.74	0.10	0.01	2.32	0	0.82	0.10	0.01	2.95	0
2	60	0.24	0.23	0.22	0.29	0	0.22	0.22	0.19	0.25	0	0.42	0.20	0.15	2.43	0	0.29	0.23	0.15	2.43	0
2	80	1.33	0.64	0.44	5.31	0	1.33	0.70	0.34	4.49	0	1.79	1.61	0.39	4.30	0	1.48	1.02	0.34	5.31	0
2	100	1.49	0.98	0.53	3.63	0	1.78	1.00	0.72	4.54	0	0.94	0.71	0.51	2.51	0	1.40	0.93	0.51	4.54	0
		0.80	0.36	0.01	5.31	0	0.83	0.30	0.01	4.54	0	0.78	0.31	0.01	4.30	0	0.80	0.32	0.01	5.31	0
3	20	2.01	2.52	0.23	3.15	0	1.41	1.77	0.19	2.46	0	1.41	1.46	0.16	3.75	0	1.61	1.85	0.16	3.75	0
3	40	23.92	6.84	0.54	124.81	0	38.97	5.05	0.63	304.06	0	216.39	4.49	0.56	2127.61	0	93.09	5.50	0.54	2127.61	0
3	60	39.66	26.57	6.62	126.54	1	108.69	18.63	4.78	704.02	0	18.40	12.77	6.91	42.99	1	57.48	19.92	4.78	704.02	2
3	80	462.72	199.61	40.84	1750.29	3	100.84	103.68	27.72	168.29	6	58.55	34.68	18.30	209.24	3	225.13	72.54	18.30	1750.29	12
3	100	270.91	218.31	50.99	596.04	6	525.85	87.81	31.07	2352.10	5	54.94	54.79	27.86	79.38	5	284.83	73.95	27.86	2352.10	16
		123.47	17.31	0.23	1750.29	10	115.98	12.78	0.19	2352.10	11	73.86	8.30	0.16	2127.61	9	104.09	10.72	0.16	2352.10	30
4	20	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0
4	40	0.44	0.02	0.01	1.46	0	0.38	0.02	0.01	1.66	0	0.38	0.02	0.01	1.53	0	0.40	0.02	0.01	1.66	0
4	60	0.24	0.23	0.21	0.28	0	0.23	0.23	0.20	0.27	0	0.21	0.21	0.15	0.25	0	0.22	0.23	0.15	0.28	0
4	80	0.84	0.53	0.39	1.44	0	1.44	1.60	0.37	2.76	0	1.65	1.57	0.35	4.09	0	1.31	1.41	0.35	4.09	0
4	100	1.22	1.01	0.74	3.56	0	2.71	2.06	0.51	6.26	0	1.93	0.89	0.48	5.00	0	1.95	0.98	0.48	6.26	0
		0.55	0.25	0.01	3.56	0	0.95	0.25	0.01	6.26	0	0.83	0.24	0.01	5.00	0	0.78	0.25	0.01	6.26	0
5	20	2.17	2.49	0.18	5.36	0	2.13	1.87	0.18	5.39	0	1.34	0.74	0.21	3.85	0	1.88	1.87	0.18	5.39	0
5	40	21.59	5.59	0.82	66.19	1	64.12	5.18	2.38	327.80	1	5.05	4.07	0.54	12.64	0	29.35	5.20	0.54	327.80	2
5	60	170.16	19.43	10.73	643.32	3	39.78	31.33	4.09	93.73	3	47.54	12.91	6.53	293.40	0	81.04	17.73	4.09	643.32	6
5	80	832.08	526.51	26.06	2395.61	4	138.64	101.81	25.94	359.81	5	209.72	64.21	16.76	892.81	2	387.55	101.81	16.76	2395.61	11
5	100	366.41	203.19	184.46	711.58	7	1436.20	1436.20	1436.20	1436.20	9	376.63	143.92	34.87	1883.37	2	462.37	193.83	34.87	1883.37	18
		214.25	12.04	0.18	2395.61	15	93.94	6.53	0.18	1436.20	18	113.70	10.74	0.21	1883.37	4	139.25	9.98	0.18	2395.61	37
6	20	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0
6	40	0.69	0.02	0.01	2.78	0	0.37	0.02	0.01	1.26	0	0.24	0.03	0.01	1.05	0	0.43	0.02	0.01	2.78	0
6	60	0.22	0.22	0.19	0.24	0	0.21	0.21	0.15	0.25	0	0.19	0.20	0.15	0.24	0	0.21	0.21	0.15	0.25	0
6	80	0.77	0.42	0.34	2.06	0	1.26	0.90	0.29	3.33	0	0.58	0.32	0.26	2.87	0	0.87	0.40	0.26	3.33	0
6	100	0.73	0.70	0.65	0.85	0	2.74	3.68	0.59	4.57	0	0.94	0.56	0.47	3.98	0	1.47	0.70	0.47	4.57	0
		0.48	0.23	0.01	2.78	0	0.91	0.22	0.01	4.57	0	0.39	0.21	0.01	3.98	0	0.60	0.23	0.01	4.57	0
7	20	2.81	2.57	1.70	4.16	0	3.21	3.03	0.78	7.26	0	3.34	3.28	1.12	5.85	0	3.12	2.89	0.78	7.26	0
7	40	588.34	15.86	4.14	1995.20	1	492.04	11.88	3.42	3159.14	1	10.67	5.98	3.11	32.16	0	351.08	12.07	3.11	3159.14	2
7	60	23.84	23.84	23.84	23.84	9	330.31	330.31	65.48	595.14	8	293.33	28.11	5.76	2008.52	2	275.55	39.31	5.76	2008.52	19
7	80	119.79	119.79	119.79	119.79	9					10	897.89	30.61	29.59	2633.47	7	703.36	75.20	29.59	2633.47	26
7	100					10					10	2976.24	2976.24	2523.98	3428.51	8	2976.24	2976.24	2523.98	3428.51	28
		260.32	4.16	1.70	1995.20	29	243.86	6.87	0.78	3159.14	29	337.36	6.33	1.12	3428.51	17	289.61	6.33	0.78	3428.51	75
8	20	7.24	3.82	2.70	32.54	0	4.04	3.17	1.39	7.20	0	3.60	3.59	1.80	5.46	0	4.96	3.50	1.39	32.54	0
8	40	122.28	35.51	15.01	530.00	2	154.01	28.13	7.33	772.32	2	11.00	7.32	4.16	41.59	0	89.24	18.35	4.16	772.32	4
8	60	245.57	89.54	35.19	768.01	6	790.76	28.03	22.36	2321.90	7	109.60	49.69	9.82	412.88	4	308.63	47.38	9.82	2321.90	17
8	80					10					10	2917.53	2917.53	2397.57	3437.50	8	2917.53	2917.53	2397.57	3437.50	28
8	100	144.22	144.22	144.22	144.22	9	1479.94	1479.94	1479.94	1479.94	9	311.61	311.61	311.61	311.61	9	645.26	311.61	144.22	1479.94	27
		94.66	18.78	2.70	768.01	27	232.94	10.91	1.39	2321.90	28	239.66	7.00	1.80	3437.50	21	192.60	9.67	1.39	3437.50	76
9	20	0.63	0.23	0.21	3.00	0	0.51	0.27	0.20	1.70	0	0.55	0.24	0.18	1.68	0	0.57	0.24	0.18	3.00	0
9	40	3.69	2.49	1.03	12.64	0	3.04	1.99	0.86	11.66	0	1.48	1.24	0.65	2.61	0	2.74	1.79	0.65	12.64	0
9	60	15.33	13.71	5.64	37.08	0	15.28	12.44	6.30	32.53	0	6.94	5.68	3.81	13.84	0	12.52	10.98	3.81	37.08	0
9	80	58.46	51.81	15.29	139.71	0	44.20	42.25	19.79	71.89	0	19.56	18.59	8.25	33.52	0	40.74	32.51	8.25	139.71	0
9	100	198.30	113.16	0.00	592.43	0	146.86	125.91	75.34	305.05	0	54.46	42.40	26.82	110.12	0	133.21	94.07	0.00	592.43	0
		55.28	12.52	0.00	592.43	0	41.98	12.56	0.20	305.05	0	16.60	5.68	0.18	110.12	0	37.95	10.98	0.00	592.43	0
10	20	2.03	1.83	0.20	4.29	0	1.75	1.85	0.53	3.08	0	1.73	1.74	0.24	3.40	0	1.84	1.76	0.20	4.29	0
10	40	21.96	2.22	0.60	175.73	0	13.09	3.38	0.43	103.75	0	2.27	1.65	0.36	5.26	0	12.44	2.31	0.36	175.73	0
10	60	14.80	10.46	6.06	35.88	1	15.51	8.66	5.08	65.43	1	8.28	6.74	0.84	34.47	0	12.70	8.39	0.84	65.43	2
10	80	51.53	25.45	10.41	222.78	3	220.03	20.10	13.77	1812.68	1	25.27	18.90	4.69	57.86	1	102.74	20.10	4.69	1812.68	5
10	100	145.47	38.22	15.89	801.33	3	616.26	61.51	27.76	3424.50	4	70.61	26.18	11.65	424.24	1	243.24	36.50	11.65	3424.50	8
		40.75	10.03	0.20	801.33	7	135.59	8.39	0.43	3424.50	6	20.53	5.02	0.24	424.24	2	64.47	7.29	0.20	3424.50	15
All		71.54	2.57	0.00	2395.61	97	81.71	2.58	0.01	3587.90	100	71.84	2.87	0.01	3437.49	59	74.91	2.65	0.00	3587.90	256

Table 4: Comparison of Upper bounds

		Class A						Class B						Class C						All classes					
	n	δ^F	δ^A	δ^E	η^F	η^A	η^E	δ^F	δ^A	δ^E	η^F	η^A	η^E	δ^F	δ^A	δ^E	η^F	η^A	η^E	δ^F	δ^A	δ^E	η^F	η^A	η^E
1	20	18.0	3.6	0.0	4	7	10	21.7	1.4	0.0	3	8	10	51.6	4.9	0.0	1	6	10	30.5	3.3	0.0	8	21	30
1	40	24.3	8.4	8.9	1	2	4	27.6	9.4	13.2	1	4	5	45.3	18.7	11.6	1	4	6	32.4	12.2	11.2	3	10	15
1	60	22.1	9.0	50.0	0	3	0	36.5	11.2	58.4	0	2	0	53.9	33.1	132.1	0	4	1	37.5	17.8	78.4	0	9	1
1	80	19.7	5.6	147.3	1	4	0	34.8	11.8	346.7	1	3	0	69.8	23.4	683.5	0	6	0	41.4	13.6	382.5	2	13	0
1	100	21.9	10.0	523.9	0	1	0	39.6	17.8	913.9	1	1	0	104.0	58.1	2147.0	0	1	0	55.2	28.6	1194.9	1	3	0
		21.2	7.3	146.0	6	17	14	32.0	10.3	266.4	6	18	15	64.9	27.6	602.6	2	21	17	39.4	15.1	334.8	14	56	46
2	20	0.0	0.0	0.0	10	10	10	2.2	0.0	0.0	9	10	10	1.7	0.0	0.0	8	10	10	1.3	0.0	0.0	27	30	30
2	40	6.4	4.7	7.9	5	8	0	10.6	3.7	8.5	6	8	0	33.7	4.2	28.7	4	8	1	16.9	4.2	15.0	15	24	1
2	60	44.6	1.3	406.4	2	5	0	19.3	5.0	610.5	2	3	0	42.7	11.6	1102.5	3	5	0	35.5	6.0	709.8	7	13	0
2	80	11.0	4.8	4132.6	3	5	0	8.4	1.6	4755.3	3	5	0	22.3	11.0	11144.7	2	4	0	13.9	5.8	6743.8	8	14	0
2	100	1.7	0.9	5579.3	3	5	0	4.6	4.1	9018.8	1	1	0	14.9	9.2	20412.2	1	2	0	7.1	4.7	11368.7	5	8	0
		12.8	2.3	2025.2	23	33	10	9.0	2.9	2886.8	21	27	10	23.1	7.2	6254.5	18	29	11	14.9	4.1	3716.3	62	89	31
3	20	39.6	9.5	2.7	1	4	9	66.9	23.0	8.3	2	5	9	63.7	8.4	0.0	3	6	10	56.7	13.7	3.7	6	15	28
3	40	28.2	15.4	14.6	1	2	3	50.0	29.5	29.6	0	2	3	63.3	36.8	39.8	1	3	4	47.2	27.3	28.0	2	7	10
3	60	37.1	13.7	153.1	0	1	0	52.3	22.0	130.5	0	1	0	88.4	45.1	166.5	0	1	0	59.3	26.9	150.1	0	3	0
3	80	47.6	17.5	446.6	0	0	0	82.5	44.7	982.9	0	0	0	131.7	74.4	778.4	0	2	0	87.3	45.5	736.0	0	2	0
3	100	38.4	17.8	873.6	0	1	0	60.2	30.3	1457.3	0	2	0	144.9	89.5	3003.7	0	0	0	81.1	45.8	1778.2	0	3	0
		38.2	14.8	298.1	2	8	12	62.4	29.9	521.7	2	10	12	98.4	50.8	797.7	4	12	14	66.3	31.8	539.2	8	30	38
4	20	19.6	0.0	0.0	6	10	10	5.2	0.0	0.0	8	10	10	2.8	0.0	0.0	7	10	10	9.2	0.0	0.0	21	30	30
4	40	12.1	0.6	1.7	1	5	3	30.1	6.7	12.3	1	2	0	341.4	54.4	83.9	2	5	2	127.9	20.5	32.6	4	12	5
4	60	77.2	23.1	471.7	0	2	0	78.7	27.3	514.0	0	1	0	130.0	39.0	755.0	0	2	0	95.3	29.8	584.0	0	5	0
4	80	50.5	17.6	1829.2	0	0	0	54.0	23.1	1812.3	0	0	0	96.2	33.6	8226.6	0	0	0	66.9	24.8	3808.8	0	0	0
4	100	24.3	11.1	5890.4	0	0	0	36.5	14.3	8423.9	0	0	0	129.5	50.9	21683.5	1	1	0	63.4	25.4	11665.3	1	1	0
		36.8	10.5	1662.4	7	17	13	40.9	14.3	2152.5	9	13	10	140.0	35.6	5782.9	10	18	12	72.5	20.1	3174.6	26	48	35
5	20	16.8	5.4	3.0	2	6	7	27.9	1.6	0.0	2	8	10	95.0	4.5	0.0	4	9	10	46.6	3.8	1.0	8	23	27
5	40	27.5	11.3	14.6	0	3	4	34.1	13.9	16.7	2	4	4	63.5	21.8	11.1	0	3	5	41.7	15.7	14.2	2	10	13
5	60	32.5	14.5	50.7	0	2	0	53.2	31.0	84.5	0	3	0	63.9	32.5	132.0	1	2	0	49.9	26.0	88.9	1	7	0
5	80	35.1	14.0	328.4	0	2	0	63.1	28.0	440.8	0	2	0	70.0	30.0	777.2	0	2	0	56.1	24.0	515.5	0	6	0
5	100	40.7	18.0	630.6	0	1	0	66.4	40.9	1141.8	0	0	0	158.5	90.5	2220.4	0	1	0	88.5	49.8	1330.9	0	2	0
		30.5	12.6	208.6	2	14	11	48.9	23.1	336.8	4	17	14	90.2	35.9	638.3	5	17	15	56.5	23.9	394.2	11	48	40
6	20	36.7	0.0	0.0	3	10	10	19.0	0.0	0.0	3	10	10	8.1	0.0	0.0	4	10	10	21.3	0.0	0.0	10	30	30
6	40	65.2	18.1	19.2	0	2	1	45.0	13.5	16.1	0	2	1	230.8	61.8	150.5	0	2	1	113.7	31.1	61.9	0	6	3
6	60	102.4	11.5	625.0	0	4	0	141.0	15.2	657.5	0	0	0	399.3	218.9	3073.5	0	0	0	214.2	81.9	1396.1	0	4	0
6	80	61.6	1.7	2541.6	0	2	0	57.7	9.2	4408.7	0	0	0	409.3	46.8	17238.9	0	0	0	176.2	19.2	7746.7	0	2	0
6	100	69.0	15.4	6310.5	0	0	0	110.5	24.7	8378.1	0	0	0	192.7	57.2	16434.8	0	0	0	124.1	32.4	10374.4	0	0	0
		67.0	9.3	1899.2	3	18	11	74.6	12.5	2692.1	3	12	11	248.0	76.9	7263.9	4	12	11	129.9	32.9	3907.0	10	42	33
7	20	30.1	10.6	3.4	0	4	9	16.2	11.7	0.0	4	4	10	28.5	12.2	0.0	4	6	10	24.9	11.5	1.1	8	14	29
7	40	43.5	26.9	30.5	0	0	0	56.0	38.1	33.0	0	0	0	120.8	98.4	71.5	0	0	1	73.4	54.4	45.0	0	0	1
7	60	39.6	27.3	83.8	0	0	0	62.0	50.1	179.6	0	0	0	167.2	137.4	409.8	0	0	0	89.6	71.6	225.9	0	0	0
7	80	41.7	28.0	523.0	0	0	0	73.9	52.3	760.5	0	0	0	122.1	96.6	1837.6	0	0	0	79.2	59.0	1040.4	0	0	0
7	100	38.1	26.8	772.4	0	0	0	68.8	49.1	1324.1	0	0	0	235.4	209.6	4148.8	0	0	0	114.1	95.2	2081.8	0	0	0
		38.6	23.9	282.6	0	4	9	55.4	40.3	465.1	4	4	10	134.8	110.8	1293.5	4	6	11	76.3	58.3	681.9	8	14	30
8	20	16.5	3.8	0.1	0	4	9	12.8	3.2	0.0	3	6	10	67.3	55.7	0.0	0	2	10	32.2	20.9	0.0	3	12	29
8	40	43.4	28.6	30.5	0	0	0	59.3	42.0	38.4	0	0	0	136.3	96.3	83.3	0	0	1	79.6	55.6	50.7	0	0	1
8	60	45.4	24.9	97.6	0	0	0	60.5	41.8	130.7	0	0	0	423.6	294.0	824.1	0	0	0	176.5	120.2	359.5	0	0	0
8	80	40.9	25.6	566.6	0	0	0	72.7	54.4	847.4	0	0	0	399.2	307.5	4538.8	0	0	0	170.9	129.2	1984.3	0	0	0
8	100	38.6	25.4	684.0	0	0	0	72.6	51.9	1362.5	0	0	0	254.5	206.6	4570.2	0	0	0	121.9	94.6	2205.6	0	0	0
		37.0	21.7	279.4	0	4	9	55.6	38.6	475.8	3	6	10	256.2	192.0	2003.3	0	2	11	116.2	84.1	923.8	3	12	30
9	20	2.8	0.0	0.0	9	10	10	5.9	0.0	0.0	8	10	10	1.7	0.0	0.0	9	10	10	3.5	0.0	0.0	26	30	30
9	40	2.8	0.0	0.0	7	10	10	6.9	0.0	0.0	5	10	9	10.1	0.0	0.0	8	10	10	6.6	0.0	0.0	20	30	29
9	60	1.7	0.0	0.0	7	9	10	1.3	0.0	0.0	9	10	10	5.2	2.0	0.0	8	9	10	2.7	0.7	0.0	24	28	30
9	80	0.8	0.0	0.0	8	10	10	2.5	0.0	4.1	6	10	8	5.4	0.0	0.0	8	10	10	2.9	0.0	1.4	22	30	28
9	100	1.0	0.0	37.8	8	10	8	2.0	0.0	11.1	7	10	8	2.3	0.0	7.0	8	10	6	1.8	0.0	18.6	23	30	22
		1.8	0.0	6.9	39	49	48	3.7	0.0	2.9	35	50	45	4.9	0.4	1.3	41	49	46	3.5	0.1	3.7	115	148	139
10	20	25.4	13.4	12.5	3	6	7	37.9	26.4	16.2	2	6	8	229.0	165.4	161.1	1	4	7	97.4	68.4	63.3	6	16	22
10	40	29.9	14.2	22.1	0	1	0	50.2	33.2	39.8	0	1	1	209.0	153.6	172.3	1	4	4	96.4	67.0	78.0	1	6	5
10	60	32.4	17.0	214.4	0	0	0	52.0	36.5	166.6	0	0	0	86.3	66.1	645.2	0	0	0	56.9	39.8	330.4	0	0	0
10	80	31.3	18.7	397.9	0	0	0	54.3	35.4	1058.2	0	0	0	211.6	168.1	3409.9	0	0	0	99.0	74.1	1622.0	0	0	0
10	100	30.0	17.5	1295.2	0	0	0	47.2	32.3	1872.7	0	0	0	267.1	186.6	7995.1	0	0	0	114.8	78.8	3721.0	0	0	0
		29.8	16.2	392.0	3	7	7	48.3	32.8	640.2	2	7	9	200.6	147.9	2553.0	2	8	11	92.9	65.6	1185.8	7	22	27
All		31.4	11.9	722.2	85	171	144	43.1	20.5	1042.8	89	164	146	126.1	68.5	2699.9	90	174	159	66.9	33.6	1483.7	264	509	449



Figure 3: Box plots for the mean percent deviations of the lower bounds from LB^*.

- The average δ^F and the average δ^A are larger than their respective medians (i.e., 66.85% and 33.62% versus 37.91% and 9.89%, respectively); signaling few outliers cases that are enlarging the true size of δ^F and δ^A. This is expected from $\mathcal{NP}$-hard problems.

- The mean δ^A is the smallest. It has a 33.62% point estimate and a (28.57%, 38.67%) confidence interval estimate. This implies that, on average, the application of the second phase of the algorithm does improve the solution of FF except when $L^F_{max} = L^A_{max} = L^*_{max}$. The mean improvement is of the order of 33.23%, with a 29.59% lower side estimate.

- On the other hand, the mean δ^E is the largest because $EXACT$ fails to obtain reasonably good solutions for large instances.

- The mean $L^\bullet_{max}$, $\bullet = A,\ F,\ E$, is equal for both classes A and B and larger for class C.

- There is no correlation between δ^F, δ^A, η^F, η^A and n, but there is a moderate correlation between both δ^E, η^E and n with respective 0.402 and -0.598 Pearson correlation coefficients. This infers that as the problem size increases, $EXACT$ may encounter increasing difficulty in getting the tightest upper bound.

- δ^E depends on the problem type. Its mean for categories 2, 4, and 6 are larger than those for the other categories. Similarly, η^E is category dependent. Its estimate is largest for category 9 and smallest for category

2. Finally, δ^A is category dependent. Its mean δ^A is smallest for problem types 2 and 9 and largest for problem types 7, 8, and 10.

A valid upper bound to L_{max} is the minimum of L^A_{max} and L^E_{max}. This upper bound equals LB^* for 586 out of 1500 instances; that is, in 39.07% of the cases.

6.4. Comparing FF and APPROX to GA

This section investigates the performance of *APPROX* relative to existing upper bounds. Table 5 reports the results of the 1500 instances per class and category. This specific setting is dictated by Bennell et al. (2013) who do not provide detailed results for each problem size. Column 3 gives the average number of attempts made by *HEUR* (and *HEUR'*) in order to reach a feasible solution within a single run. Columns 4 and 5 report the average runtime $RT^\bullet,\ \bullet = F,\ A,\ GA$, in seconds, with the maximum run time $\overline{RT}^\bullet$, in seconds, over each set of 50 instances reported between parentheses. Columns 6-8 report the average relative percent gap $\gamma^\bullet,\ \bullet = F,\ A,\ GA$, computed as

$$\gamma^\bullet = 100\frac{(L^\bullet_{max} - LB_1)}{LB_1}.$$

Table 5: Summary results of computational experiments

Class	Category	iter	$RT^F(\overline{RT}^F)$	$RT^A(\overline{RT}^A)$	γ^F	γ^A	γ^{GA}
A	1	25	0 (0)	18 (41)	28.4	13.9	**12.4**
	2	12	11 (25)	20 (45)	12.8	**2.3**	11.1
	3	24	2 (5)	25 (57)	46.7	22.1	**22.0**
	4	14	34 (73)	60 (135)	36.8	**10.5**	17.1
	5	29	2 (3)	25 (69)	37.9	19.1	**17.9**
	6	24	46 (101)	76 (178)	67.0	**9.3**	16.6
	7	33	0 (1)	24 (58)	43.0	27.7	**23.5**
	8	40	1 (1)	27 (59)	42.2	26.5	**23.3**
	9	2	0 (0)	12 (34)	3.5	**1.7**	1.7
	10	19	13 (29)	26 (57)	34.3	**20.2**	23.8
B	1	23	0 (0)	15 (44)	47.5	**23.1**	24.2
	2	3	10 (24)	19 (47)	9.0	**2.9**	34.0
	3	20	2 (4)	17 (46)	77.8	**41.7**	46.2
	4	21	28 (62)	50 (124)	40.9	**14.3**	36.0
	5	32	2 (4)	17 (52)	61.5	**33.3**	35.5
	6	22	39 (92)	63 (159)	74.6	**12.5**	37.7
	7	46	0 (1)	21 (55)	64.2	**48.7**	52.2
	8	47	0 (1)	21 (57)	64.2	**46.5**	49.4
	9	2	0 (0)	8 (21)	6.2	**2.4**	2.4
	10	21	11 (25)	20 (50)	57.4	**40.9**	53.5
C	1	24	0 (0)	11 (28)	117.9	**69.6**	93.0
	2	14	10 (21)	18 (42)	23.1	**7.2**	149.5
	3	24	2 (4)	20 (52)	152.0	**91.2**	124.9
	4	20	33 (72)	57 (133)	140.0	**35.6**	153.2
	5	28	3 (4)	23 (55)	146.7	**81.1**	105.0
	6	29	44 (96)	77 (183)	248.0	**76.9**	241.2
	7	41	1 (3)	25 (65)	186.3	**156.7**	209.6
	8	37	1 (3)	26 (65)	301.5	**232.2**	273.3
	9	2	0 (0)	10 (30)	15.7	10.5	**9.9**
	10	18	14 (32)	30 (71)	282.9	**214.5**	318.5

Table 5 shows that *HEUR* needs on average 23 attempts to reach a feasible solution. The mean number of attempts differs among the categories. It

is smaller when *HEUR* deals with the instances of categories 2 and 9 with respective point estimates of 9.67 and 2.00. The instances of these two categories contain many tiny items. Therefore, finding a feasible packing of the items is relatively easy. The mean number of attempts is larger for categories 7 and 8 with respective point estimates of 40.00 and 41.33. However, it is not different among sets $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{L}$; implying that it is the homogeneity of the items rather than their sizes that defines the level of difficulty of packing. Finally, this mean number of attempts does not differ among classes A, B, and C. This is expected because the differences of classes are mainly caused by the tightness of the due dates and not by the packing procedure itself.

On average, *FF* and *APPROX* identify a local optimum in 10 and 30 seconds, with the maximal run times not exceeding 100 and 180 seconds, respectively. *FF* solves the instances of set $\mathcal{L}$ particularly fast. However, it is relatively slow on the instances of set $\mathcal{S}$. In fact, the large number of items per bin for instances of $\mathcal{S}$ leads to inaccurate lower bounds $\underline{LB}$; thus, increases the number of calls to *PACK*, which checks the feasibility of a packing. In addition, this large number of items slows down *PACK*. This, in turn, translates into increased run times. *APPROX* spends, on average, approximately the same time to solve an instance of any category, except of categories 4 and 6 that represent the hardest cases in terms of computational time. Figure 4 displays the confidence interval estimates of the mean run times per category of *FF* and *APPROX*.

APPROX solves many of the instances of categories 2 and 9 to optimality. It neither reaches the optimum nor proves the optimality of its solutions for any of the instances of categories 7 and 8. In fact, the mean number of times optimality is proven is category dependent. However, it does not differ among sets or classes.

Both the mean and the maximum run times of *APPROX* are less than the 120 seconds runtime of *GA*, with a 28.70 seconds mean point estimate. That is, *APPROX* is, on average, faster than *GA* and at worst comparable to *GA* in terms of runtime.



Figure 4: 95% confidence intervals for the mean run times of *FF* and *APPROX* by category

The mean optimality gaps of *FF* and *GA* are not different whereas *FF* is faster than *GA*. In addition, the mean optimality gap of *APPROX* is smaller

than its *GA* counterpart. As further substantiated by Figure 5, *APPROX* produces better results than *GA* more frequently, in particular for class C, whose items have a wider range of due dates. Figure 6 infers that *APPROX* outperforms *GA* for instances of set $\mathcal{L}$.



Figure 5: Observed percent optimality gaps of *FF*, *APPROX* and *GA* by class



Figure 6: 95% confidence interval of the mean percent optimality gaps of *FF*, *APPROX* and *GA* by set

With respect to due dates, the hardness of the instances decreases as β increases. The mean difference between the optimality gaps of *APPROX* and *GA* depends on the class: Its point estimates are -1.61, -10.48, and -70.30% for classes A, B, and C, respectively. (However, its magnitude depends also on the set as previously discussed.)

- Class A is the hardest for *APPROX*, which is sometimes outperformed by *GA*, in particular on instances of $\mathcal{S}$. However, the advantage of *GA* is

limited. The difference between the gaps is rather small, and its average is negative; thus favoring *APPROX*.

- In addition, *GA* is outperformed by *APPROX* for classes B and C. *GA* along with its decoding packing algorithm are strongly oriented towards obtaining a dense packing; a rather important criterion for class A whose instances are characterized by narrow intervals of due dates. However, *GA* is myopic when the due dates are sparse along the time horizon. Interestingly, *FF* outperforms *GA* on some categories of classes B and C.

The mean difference between the optimality gaps of *GA* and *APPROX* is strictly positive with point and confidence interval estimates of 27.45% and (10.68%, 44.22%). Therefore, *APPROX* reduces L_{max}^{GA}. Furthermore, *GA* is not necessarily superior to *FF*. In fact, *FF* is as competitive as *GA*, with both dominated by *APPROX* on average. These inferences hold regardless of the class as supported by Figure 7.



Figure 7: 95% Bonferroni confidence intervals for the maximum lateness of *FF*, *APPROX* and *GA*

The mean optimality gap is sensitive to the class. Class C has the largest mean optimality gap for the three methods. Instances of type 9 have the tightest optimality gap across the three methods, and instances of type 2 have tight optimality gaps for *APPROX* and *FF* as further substantiated by the number of times *APPROX* obtains the optimal solution and the average number of attempts made by *HEUR* in order to reach a feasible solution for these two types of instances. However, the mean optimality gap does not differ among the instance types.

The sizes of the optimality gaps seem unusually high. Even though part of its magnitude may be due to the quality of the upper bounds obtained by *FF*, *APPROX* and *GA*, most of it is most likely due to the looseness of the lower bound. The comparison of Tables 4 and 5 further supports this claim, where Table 4 reports the percent deviations of *FF* and *APPROX* from the best

lower bound LB^* whereas Table 5 reports the same deviations with respect to LB_1. For instance, for *FF*, Table 5 indicates that this gap is 282.9% for class C, category 10, whereas this gap is only 204% in Table 4. A good example is rand10.txt_C_1, the 10th instance of category 1, class C of size $n = 20$. The percent gaps of *FF* and *APPROX* are 136% when computed with respect to LB_1= 69, but become 0% when computed with respect to LB_3= 163. In fact, the upper bound matches LB_3 in this case; thus, proving the optimality of the solutions obtained by *FF* and *APPROX*. Even though the instances are numerous, we will cite here only a second example: rand6.txt_C_10 of category 10, class C, $n = 20$, where LB_1= 3 results in an optimality gap of 1533% whereas LB_3= 92 proves the optimality of the upper bound obtained by *APPROX*.

In summary, the proposed approach enhances many existing upper bounds, shows the tightness of existing and proposed lower bounds, and proves the optimality of many open benchmark problems. It outperforms *GA* both in terms of solution quality, computational run time, and number of proven optimal solutions.

7. Conclusion

This paper addresses the two-dimensional non-oriented bin packing problem with due dates. It proposes a lower bound, an exact mixed integer model, and an approximate approach. The approximate approach significantly enhances existing results on many benchmark instances from the literature, solving 33.93% of the instances to optimality. Because the exact model can be solved to optimality by an off-the-shelf solver, the total percent of instances solved to optimality is 39.07%.

Unlike many traditional constructive packing heuristics, the packing approach packs simultaneously several items into several bins and takes advantage of the feasibility constraints to guide the search to a local optimum. Its concept of free regions is not specific to the due date complicating constraints. It makes the proposed approach easily adaptable to other complex bin-packing related problems with problem-specific constraints such as routing, time windows, and tardiness related costs. Since the dual feasible functions are applicable to higher-dimensional packing, the approach can also be extended to this area.

References

Arbib, C., & Marinelli, F. (2014). On cutting stock with due dates. *Omega*, *46*, 11 – 20. doi:10.1016/j.omega.2014.01.004.

BenBassat, M. (2016). Production chain optimization for wood frame manufacturers. *www.plataine.com/production-chain-optimization-for-wood-frame-manufacturers*, . [Online; accessed November 2016].

Bennell, J. A., Soon Lee, L., & Potts, C. N. (2013). A genetic algorithm for two-dimensional bin packing with due dates. *International Journal of Production Economics*, *145*, 547–560.

Bockmayr, A., & Hooker, J. N. (2005). Constraint programming. In *Discrete Optimization* (pp. 559 – 600). Elsevier volume 12 of *Handbooks in Operations Research and Management Science*. doi:10.1016/S0927-0507(05)12010-6.

Brucker, P., Gladky, A., Hoogeveen, H., Kovalyov, M. Y., Potts, C. N., & Tautenhahn, T. (1998). Scheduling a batching machine. *Journal of Scheduling*, (pp. 31–54).

Burke, E., Hyde, M., & Kendall, G. (2006). Evolving bin packing heuristics with genetic programming. In *Parallel Problem Solving from Nature - PPSN IX* (pp. 860–869). Springer volume 4193 of *LNCS*. doi:10.1007/11844297_87.

Cabo, M., Possani, E., Potts, C., & X., S. (2015). Splitmerge: Using exponential neighborhood search for scheduling a batching machine. *Computers and Operations Research*, *63*, 125–135.

Chen, C., Lee, S., & Shen, Q. (1995). An analytical model for the container loading problem. *European Journal of Operational Research*, *80*, 68 – 76.

Clautiaux, F., Jouglet, A., Carlier, J., & Moukrim, A. (2008). A new constraint programming approach for the orthogonal packing problem. *Computers & Operations Research*, *35*, 944–959. doi:10.1016/j.cor.2006.05.012.

Dell'Amico, M., Martello, S., & Vigo, D. (2002). A lower bound for the non-oriented two-dimensional bin packing problem. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, *118*, 13 – 24. doi:10.1016/S0166-218X(01)00253-0.

Fekete, S. P., & Schepers, J. (2004). A general framework for bounds for higher-dimensional orthogonal packing problems. *Math. Meth. of OR*, *60*, 311–329.

G. Belov, E. A. M., G. Scheithauer (2008). One-dimensional heuristics adapted for two-dimensional rectangular strip packing. *The Journal of the Operational Research Society*, *59*, 823–832.

Iori, M., & Martello, S. (2013). An annotated bibliography of combined routing and loading problems. *Yugoslav Journal of Operations Research*, *23*, 311–326. doi:10.2298/YJOR130315032I.

Jansen, K., & Pradel, L. (2016). New approximability results for two-dimensional bin packing. *Algorithmica*, *74*, 208–269.

Johnson, D. S., Demers, A., Ullman, J., Garey, M., & Graham, R. (1974). Worst-case performance bounds for simple one-dimensional packing algorithms. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, *3*, 299–325.

Li, S. (1996). Multi-Job Cutting Stock Problem with Due Dates and Release Dates. *The Journal of the Operational Research Society*, *47*, 490–510. doi:10.2307/3010726.

Lodi, A., Martello, S., Monaci, M., & Vigo, D. (2014). *Two-Dimensional Bin Packing Problems*. Wiley-ISTE. doi:10.1002/9781119005353.ch5.

Lodi, A., Martello, S., & Vigo, D. (2002). Recent advances on two-dimensional bin packing problems. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, *123*, 379 – 396. doi:10.1016/S0166-218X(01)00347-X.

López-Camacho, E., Terashima-Marin, H., Ross, P., & Ochoa, G. (2014). A unified hyper-heuristic framework for solving bin packing problems. *Expert Systems with Applications*, *41*, 6876–6889. doi:10.1016/j.eswa.2014.04.043.

Onodera, H., Taniguchi, Y., & Tamaru, K. (1991). Branch-and-bound placement for building block layout. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM/IEEE Design Automation Conference* DAC '91 (pp. 433–439). New York, NY, USA: ACM.

Polyakovskiy, S., & M'Hallah, R. (2011). An intelligent framework to online bin packing in a just-in-time environment. In *Modern Approaches in Applied Intelligence* (pp. 226–236). Springer volume 6704 of *LNCS*. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-21827-9_23.

Reinertsen, H., & Vossen, T. W. (2010). The one-dimensional cutting stock problem with due dates. *European Journal of Operational Research*, *201*, 701 – 711. doi:10.1016/j.ejor.2009.03.042.

Rossi, F., Beek, P. v., & Walsh, T. (2006). *Handbook of Constraint Programming*. New York, NY, USA: Elsevier Science Inc.

Sim, K., & Hart, E. (2013). Generating single and multiple cooperative heuristics for the one dimensional bin packing problem using a single node genetic programming island model. In *Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference, GECCO '13* (pp. 1549–1556). doi:10.1145/2463372.2463555.

Sim, K., Hart, E., & Paechter, B. (2015). A lifelong learning hyper-heuristic method for bin packing. *Evolutionary Computation*, *23*, 37–67. doi:10.1162/EVCO_a_00121.

Verstichel, J., Kinable, J., Causmaecker, P. D., & Berghe, G. V. (2015). A Combinatorial Benders' decomposition for the lock scheduling problem. *Computers & Operations Research*, *54*, 117 – 128. doi:10.1016/j.cor.2014.09.007.

Vilím, P., Laborie, P., & Shaw, P. (2015). Failure-directed search for constraint-based scheduling. In L. Michel (Ed.), *Integration of AI and OR Techniques in Constraint Programming* (pp. 437–453). Springer International Publishing volume 9075 of *LNCS*. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-18008-3_30.

Wang, C. S., & Uzsoy, R. (2002). A genetic algorithm to minimize lateness on a batch processing machine. *Computers and Operations Research*, *29*, 1621–1640.